

282056

JPRS-TAC-86-067

21 AUGUST 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

COPIES QUALITY INSPECTED 2

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19990422 115

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

8
101
A06

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

21 AUGUST 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

| | |
|---|---|
| IZVESTIYA on U.S. Strategic Programs, ABM Treaty Interpretation (F. Gontar; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 26 Jun 86)..... | 1 |
| Soviet Paper Denies Civilian Economic Benefits From SDI (S. Shumilin; Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 1 Jun 86)..... | 5 |
| Reportage on SDI Orders to FRG Firms (Bonn DIE WELT, 2 Jul 86; Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network, 14 Jul 86)..... | 8 |
| SDI Orders Total DM100 Million | 8 |
| Press on First SDI Order | 8 |

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

| | |
|---|----|
| Soviet Peace Initiatives, U.S. 'Neoglobalism' Contrasted (Anatoli Gromyko, Vladimir Lomeiko; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 5, May 86)..... | 10 |
| RENMIN RIBAO Views U.S.-USSR Nuclear Talks (Fang Min; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 29 Jul 86)..... | 24 |

SALT/START ISSUES

| | |
|---|----|
| Soviet Paper Ridicules Perle Comments on Soviet Violations (N. Novlyanskiy; Moscow GUDOK, 4 Jul 86)..... | 26 |
|---|----|

| | |
|---|----|
| Soviet Colonel Rebuts U.S. Arguments on SALT II Ceilings (Nikita Chaldimor; Moscow World Service, 14 Jul 86)..... | 28 |
| Soviet Paper Rebuts, Returns SALT Violation Charge (A. Kortunov; Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 25 Jul 86).... | 30 |
| USSR: Further Reports on Standing Consultative Commission (Moscow Television Service, 24, 25 Jul 86; Moscow TASS, 30 Jul 86)..... | 33 |
| Charges, Countercharges, by Vladimir Tsvetov | 33 |
| Words, Deeds Contrasted, by Boris Parkhomenko | 34 |
| Session Ends | 35 |
| TASS Reports 'Secret' U.S. Stealth Flights Over Europe (Moscow TASS, 24 Jul 86)..... | 36 |
| INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES | |
| TASS: FRG Communists Demand Removal of U.S. Missiles (Moscow TASS, 24 Jul 86)..... | 37 |
| PRAVDA Alleges U.S. Plans To Deploy Neutron Warheads in FRG (Vladislav Drobkov; Moscow PRAVDA, 31 Jul 86)..... | 38 |
| Briefs | |
| TASS: Turkish Aide on U.S. Dumps | 39 |
| TASS on UK Polaris Tests | 39 |
| EUROPEAN CONFERENCES | |
| USSR's Israelyan Criticizes Western Approach at CD (V. Kuznetsov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 21 Jul 86)..... | 40 |
| Brazil: Lack of Credibility in Gorbachev's Proposals Seen (Editorial; Sao Paulo O ESTADO DE SAO PAULO, 14 Jun 86).. | 42 |
| NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS | |
| Finnish Foreign Policy Institute Chief on Nordic NFZ (Kari Mottola; Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 13 Jul 86).... | 44 |
| RELATED ISSUES | |
| USSR: U.S., Soviet Stance Contrasted (Yuriy Romantsov; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 17 Jul 86).. | 49 |
| Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Views U.S., European Policies (Anatoliy Adamishin Interview; Vienna KURIER, 24 Jul 86)..... | 51 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Moscow on U.S. Debates Over SALT, Test Ban (Vladimir Posner, et al.; Moscow to North America, 27 Jul 86)..... | 53 |
| USSR: Summit Depends on U.S. Arms Control Stance (Editorial; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 27, 14 Jul 86)..... | 57 |
| Soviet Commentary on Mitterrand Visit Stresses European Issues (Yuriy Borisov; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 12 Jul 86).... | 58 |
| World Scientists Federation Meets in Moscow (Various sources, various dates)..... | 60 |
| Report on Meeting | 60 |
| Appeal for Disarmament | 60 |
| Gromyko Receives Scientists | 61 |
| TV Commentary, by Aleksandr Serikov | 63 |
| World Scientists Forum in Moscow Discusses Arms Issues (V. Baberdin, M. Rebrov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 23 Jul 86)..... | 65 |
| TASS: Socialist States Urge Ad Hoc UN Disarmament Conference (Sergey Baybakov; Moscow TASS, 9 Jul 86)..... | 68 |
| PRAVDA Weekly Review: Test Ban Verification, SALT, UK Trip (Nikolay Kurdyumov; Moscow PRAVDA, 20 Jul 86)..... | 70 |
| Soviet Book on U.S. 'Policy of Eroding Treaties' (Moscow TASS, 29 Jul 86)..... | 74 |
| Moscow Talk Show: SCC, SALT II, Test Ban, European, Asian Issues (Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 27 Jul 86)..... | 75 |
| Soviet-Uruguayan Communique Discusses Arms Issues (Moscow TASS, 26 Jul 86)..... | 82 |
| Soviet Asian Security Policies Outlined (M. Petrov; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 5, May 86)... | 85 |
| Soviet-Chinese Talks on Arms Control Issues (Moscow TASS, 25 Jul 86; Beijing XINHUA, 25 Jul 86)..... | 95 |
| TASS Report | 95 |
| XINHUA Report | 95 |
| Briefs | |
| Soviet-Canadian Talks | 96 |
| Soviet-Swiss Talks | 96 |
| Wu Xueqian Meets U.S. ACDA Head | 96 |

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

IZVESTIYA ON U.S. STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, ABM TREATY INTERPRETATION

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 86 p 5

[Article by Candidate of Military Sciences F. Gontar: "Dangerous Turn"]

[Text] At the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee in Budapest the Warsaw Pact states confirmed their adherence to the treaties and agreements in the sphere of arms limitation and disarmament and insistently called on the United States for strict compliance with the strategic arms limitation agreements. Unfortunately, it has to be stated that Washington's practical actions are aimed in a directly opposite direction. Washington's decision to actually discontinue the United States' subsequent observance of the Soviet-American treaty-legal documents on a limitation of strategic offensive arms--the 1972 Interim Agreement and the 1979 SALT II Treaty--testifies to this.

Attempting to justify in the eyes of the world, including American, community the abandonment of the SALT II Treaty, the U.S. Administration unfoundedly accused the Soviet Union of violations of the provisions of this treaty. There have been and are no such violations on our part. The Soviet Union has fulfilled and continues to fulfill strictly and in full all the commitments which it has assumed.

Washington is expatiating incessantly about the fact that for a decade the United States has been "inactive" and occupied a position of "restraint". But such assertions do not, to put it mildly, correspond to the truth and are intended for the uninitiated. In reality it was precisely in the period of so-called "restraint" that the United States was the first to embark on the mass provision of its ICBM's and SLBM's with independently targeted multiple warheads. As a result of such "inactivity" the number of nuclear warheads on American strategic missiles was increased several times over.

Washington also prefers to remain silent about the fact that as a result of the modernization of its Minuteman-3 ICBM's in recent years (three independently targeted warheads each) their nuclear power and strike accuracy have been doubled.

Currently the United States is completing the flight tests of the highly accurate MX ICBM, which is fitted with ten 600-kiloton warheads. It is planned beginning

deployment of the MX missiles this year even. Simultaneously another new (mobile) ICBM, the Midgetman, of which it is planned deploying up to 1,000, although the SALT II Treaty bans the creation, testing and deployment of a second new type of ICBM, is at the full-scale development stage.

Endeavoring to impart a first "disarming" strike capacity to its sea-based strategic forces, the Pentagon is continuing the provision of surface ships and nuclear-powered submarines en masse with highly accurate long-range (up to 2,600 km) Tomahawk nuclear cruise missiles. The construction of the Ohio-class missile-firing nuclear submarines, each with 24 launchers, is under way at an accelerated pace. Eight such missile-firing submarines are already in service currently, and it is planned raising their number to 20 altogether by the end of the 1990's. Up to 1989 the Ohio-class missile-firing submarines will be armed with Trident 1 missiles and, after this, with the new highly accurate Trident 2 missiles.

Measures are being implemented simultaneously to build up the combat possibilities of the third component of the strategic "triad". The modernization of the existing B-52 bombers and their provision with long-range cruise missiles are continuing. The series construction of the new B-1 heavy bombers has begun and the Stealth ATB invisible aircraft, which in the 1990's will constitute the basis of the United States' strategic aviation, is being developed. As is known, in accordance with the SALT II Treaty, the total number of strategic delivery systems (ICBM and SLBM launchers fitted with independently targeted warheads and bombers fitted with long-range cruise missiles) must not exceed 1,320. Up to now the sides have observed these ceilings. Now, however, the treaty framework no longer suits the United States, which intends fitting B-52 aircraft with cruise missiles, disregarding all restrictions.

It was precisely the aspiration of the U.S. military-political leadership to realize at all costs the planned programs of the creation and deployment of a new generation of highly accurate nuclear first "disarming" strike weapons and impart to the strategic "triad" a new qualitative level which served as the main reason for the United States' abandonment of the SALT II Treaty, which enshrined the sides' military-strategic parity. Eloquent recognition of this is the utterance of R. Bowman, president of the American Institute for the Study of Space and Security, who declared without beating about the bush: "We are tired of equality. The sole method by which we can restore to ourselves a lever of political pressure consists of once again acquiring absolute military superiority." And this, he believes, will be possible if the "rearmament" program advanced by R. Reagan is carried out in full. This is the true reason for the United States' decision to discontinue observance in the future of strategic offensive arms limitations.

Simultaneously with realization of the "program for the modernization of strategic forces in full" the United States is speeding up work on the creation and deployment of strike space-based arms. As is known, the Soviet Union resolutely supports the banning of such arms, believing that their development, testing and deployment will lead to an arms race in all areas.

Contrary to common sense, the U.S. Administration is making constant attempts not only to ensure the inviolability of the "star wars" program at the negotiations

on nuclear and space-based arms in Geneva but also to substantiate the "legitimacy and permissibility" of practical tests and "experiments" within the framework of this program.

Realization of the "star wars" program is manifestly at odds with the Soviet-American ABM Treaty. And Washington is well aware of this. Nonetheless, the United States is insisting that it "must assure itself that treaties and agreements do not block the possibilities of the creation of military-space potentials." And Pentagon chief C. Weinberger declares plainly: "If we can acquire a system which is effective and renders the Soviet Union's arms ineffective, we will have returned to the situation which we were in when we were the sole country possessing nuclear weapons." Such is the longed-for dream of the champions of the sinister "star wars" program. It is not equal security for all which Washington is concerned about but having an opportunity to dictate its will to other countries and peoples.

In advocating a "broader interpretation of the provisions of the ABM Treaty" the U.S. Administration is seeking conditions which would make it possible "to proceed with the testing and development of components of an antimissile defense which are based on different physical principles." What is meant by such components are primarily X-ray lasers operating thanks to the energy of nuclear explosions and a whole number of other nuclear devices, which are being tested at the test site in Nevada and with which the Pentagon wants to lard outer space. The U.S. Administration's endeavor to test these nuclear devices is the main reason for its unwillingness to join in the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions.

In endeavoring to realize the "star wars" program at all costs the U.S. Administration is pursuing the goal not only of making nuclear arms limitations and reductions impossible but fundamentally undermining the very idea of strategic stability and the principle of equality and equal security.

An eloquent acknowledgement of the fact that the instigator of the race in nuclear and now space-based arms is precisely the United States is the statement made by G. Kennan, the well-known and well-informed veteran of American diplomacy. He said literally the following: "Let us not confuse the issue by heaping the entire responsibility on our adversaries. We should remember that it is we Americans who at each turning of the path have been the initiators of the further development of nuclear weapons." Truly said. The peaceable assurances of the U.S. Administration cannot be taken seriously.

As a counterweight to the militarist policy of the United States the Soviet Union has put forward a specific program for the universal elimination by the end of the century of nuclear and other types of weapon of mass annihilation and a moratorium on nuclear explosions. A substantial supplement to this program was the proposal of the Warsaw Pact states concerning a 25-percent reduction in the next few years in armed forces and conventional arms throughout Europe--from the Atlantic to the Urals. The speculative argument of the Atlantists that nuclear disarmament in Europe, given preservation of the present level of conventional armed forces, would put the West European states in a disadvantageous position is thereby swept away.

Reactionary ruling circles of the United States, who evaluate the current world situation in "star wars" and nuclear warhead categories, have seen the Soviet peace initiatives as a powerful impediment to the realization of their imperial designs aimed at world domination and social revanche. Being incapable of proposing to the peoples a peaceful historical alternative corresponding to the interests of all, they, in gambling on naked force, the nuclear fist and terrorist outrages, are kindling militarist hysteria, which, according to their illusory calculations, could freeze historical progress and impede the development of the socialist countries and keep the world in the shackles of the arms race. In order to frustrate these dangerous designs the Soviet Union, as the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum observed, will continue to perseveringly implement its initiatives corresponding to the treasured hopes of the Soviet people and all peoples of our planet. The USSR will never permit the United States to have nuclear superiority. It considers it impermissible to put the fate of the world into imperialist hands in order for imperialist reaction to succeed in imposing on mankind an intensification of the military-political confrontation.

Reliable security for all countries and peoples and peaceful conditions of their development and progress in the nuclear age may be ensured only by political means and the joint efforts of all states. The world community expects common sense to prevail in U.S. ruling circles and a display of political will to curb the insane arms race, seek mutually acceptable solutions and prevent mankind's further slide toward thermonuclear catastrophe.

8850

CSO: 5200/1469

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET PAPER DENIES CIVILIAN ECONOMIC BENEFITS FROM SDI

Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 1 Jun 86 p 3

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences S. Shumilin: "Cui Bono?"]

[Text] "I believe that we need to listen to the opinion of experts on the problem. SDI is a strategic issue connected mainly with security policy. And physicists hardly have a grasp of this." This was stated recently in the course of a discussion in the West German magazine DIE STERN by Volker Ruehe, deputy chairman of the CDU/CSU Bundestag faction. Everything indicates that for him the question of the FRG's participation in the preparation of "star wars" being undertaken by Washington is no question at all. Arguments "for" can be sensed in his every word.

"Some firms will participate in the SDI program," Herr Ruehe continues. "It will be profitable for them."

So it may be thought that it is only concern for security and technological progress which is pulling the FRG under the canopy of the American "umbrella" of space stations with laser and nuclear installations. As the course of the numerous discussions which have developed in West Germany recently following the government's announced intention of associating itself with the American "star wars" plans has shown, the ruling circles have firmly assimilated the transatlantic arguments in support of the "star wars" program.

Assurances are being given, for example, that SDI is a purely research program whose "product" will be concepts and ideas sufficiently universal for them to be used both in military and civilian spheres. In addition, according to the claims of the U.S. Administration, besides ideas, a result of SDI could be engineering systems and materials which could also be employed for nonmilitary, purely commercial purposes.

However, far from everyone in West Germany is being blinded by the glaring light of the publicity lamps of the SDI "umbrella"; far from everyone is perceiving as a reality the far-fetched, invented "Soviet military threat," which the planned space lasers are allegedly called upon to remove. The supporters of the official position of the FRG's ruling coalition have many opponents.

The magazine DIE STERN afforded the physicist Bernhard (Gonzior), one of these opponents, who is well known in the country, an opportunity to have his say on the problems of SDI. Taking issue with Ruehe, he claims that speaking in earnest about the dangerous consequences of a militarization of space, including the change, given the commissioning of the SDI system, in the strategic balance of forces in the world which exists currently, is by no means "rubbish". "Furthermore, the strategic situation," the scientist emphasizes, "could change radically, and the danger of war will grow since SDI contains extremely destabilizing factors." B. (Gonzior) believes that even "an incomplete SDI system, which is technically perfectly feasible, will immediately become strategically dangerous."

Approximately 15,000 West German scientists have already emphatically opposed the FRG's association with the plans for the militarization of space. The most prominent specialists, taking as a basis mathematical calculations and strict proof, are warning Bonn's politicians, first, about the impossibility of guaranteeing the precision and smoothness of the operation of such an intricate complex as practically any version of the ABM system which is being developed would be and, finally, about the futility of attempts to secure political control of the decision-making process in this automated system.

Scientists also consider highly dubious the prospects of the use of SDI developments for civilian purposes. These doubts, they believe, are being implanted by the very practice and patenting of the results of military R&D in the United States, which refute the principle extensively publicized by the Pentagon of the growing degree of the "concurrent application" of the new types of technology (space technology, in particular) in the civil and military spheres. Thus Doctors J. Eisbach and R. Rilling point out in this connection that of the 328 patents which resulted from NASA research programs prior to 1963, only 16 percent had "commercial potential". Furthermore, according to the results of polls of a large number of American military-industrial companies, only one-tenth approximately of all the inventions made by these companies when fulfilling military orders is used commercially. Finally, J. Eisbach and R. Rilling believe, even when the results of SDI could in principle be passed onto the civilian sphere of the FRG economy, the U.S. Government would hardly consent to this and lift the prohibitions imposed owing to "national security" considerations.

It is significant that the idea of the "commercial use" of SDI which is being propagandized so actively by Washington is even being opposed by certain representatives of FRG business circles. Of course, extracting a pile of money from orders of the Pentagon's "star wars" department is a beguiling prospect for them. But it transpires that even these circles have serious doubts concerning the economic benefits of participation in SDI.

We will cite as an example the opinion of (Kh. Skoludek)--a member of the board of the West German Zeiss Company, which produces precision optical instruments: "We do not want to engage in what does not correspond to the firm's strategy," he says. "What is the point of us making big capital investments, opening a special SDI department and transferring there from other departments, perhaps, the more important of our leading engineers--top-level specialists--of whom there are not that many at any firm? There is too great a risk as a result of all this of crippling our civilian sector. Consequently, there is no point breaking up the

production structure in the hope of earning a couple of million dollars over the next 2-3 years...."

What evidence can the supporters of "star wars" produce in response to this? They do not intend producing any. They simply declare the opponents' opinions dilettantist and dismiss them out of hand if they do not agree with their own.

It should be mentioned in this connection that, of course, Bonn's leaders are willingly donning Washington's bridle, harnessing themselves together with it to a single military-space team. But as politicians pretending to a knowledge of the country's interests they should be displaying greater farsightedness. B. (Gonzior) concludes the discussion in DIE STERN thus: "Politicians should know the possibilities of technology. Nuclear weapons are a real and mortally dangerous thing. This is now understood by almost everyone. But few people understand what SDI is: SDI will destabilize an already complex situation."

These words merit serious reflection in the FRG.

8850

CSO: 5200/1469

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

REPORTAGE ON SDI ORDERS TO FRG FIRMS

SDI Orders Total DM100 Million

DW021301 Bonn DIE WELT in German 2 Jul 86 p 1

[Report by "CO": "SDI Orders for German Firms"]

[Text] Bonn--FRG firms have so far obtained SDI orders totaling about DM100 million. They hold first position among all Europeans, including the British who tried especially hard to get SDI orders, and who recently achieved research contracts of more than \$14 million.

Recent reports saying that the participation of German firms in the SDI program does not pay off as much as expected, therefore, are unfounded. According to experts, the interest of the Americans to use the abilities of German industry and science for SDI is by far greater than generally reported.

Press on First SDI Order

DW141128 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 14 Jul 86

[From the Press Review]

[Text] One of the topics discussed today is the first SDI project order placed with a German firm.

The Duesseldorf *Rheinische Post* notes: For the space and aviation firm Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm [MBB] in Munich, the order received from the U.S. Defense Department is chicken feed. The equivalent of DM8.8 million for an infrared experiment in space is not much of an order for a firm of that size, but for a beginning it might still be more than was originally expected. The significance probably lies in the political and psychological fields. It was the first time that a U.S. authority placed such an order for the development of a non-nuclear missile defense system in space with a high-tech firm outside the United States.

The Freiburg *Badische Post* maintains: The first U.S. order in the framework of the SDI project given to a German firm reveals the limits of such cooperation rather than indicating a breakthrough. The size of the order alone shows how premature the hopes of those were who had hoped that SDI would produce

great technological orders for the German economy. Managers who expected only small orders from the very beginning were more realistic. The interest of such firms as MBB was directed at participating in U.S. high-tech know-how for the benefit of its own technological standards. It is questionable, however, whether the current order for the development of an infrared measurement system will be of any help in that respect.

Augsburger Allgemeine explains: Experts had expected that such an order would go to MBB and not to other FRG firms. The order was expected to involve, however, a high-efficiency laser system instead of an infrared sensor. However, all that is not so important as the fact that now a German firm will be able to test concretely whether the Americans are prepared to exchange technical SDI knowledge, or whether they want to slow the exchange down or exploit it unilaterally. These have always been the fears of German industry.

Neue Osnabruecker Zeitung points out: It would be too narrow a view to see the placing of an SDI order with MBB only from an economic perspective. In fact the agreement also has a clear political goal. That is proved by the unusual circumstance that such a relatively small order was first announced by the U.S. Defense Department. It was supposed to be a demonstration to the FRG, which supports the research program, that participation will pay off. The critics were to be deprived of their arguments. The signal is also aimed at those European allies who have so far refused to cooperate and who will realize the disadvantages now -- the Pentagon obviously hopes.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2728

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

SOVIET PEACE INITIATIVES, U.S. 'NEOGLOBALISM' CONTRASTED

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 5, May 86 pp 15-27

[Article by Anatoli Gromyko and Vladimir Lomeiko]

[Text]

Our time is imperatively entering the course of history as a turning point in many areas of domestic and international policies. Foreign policy is known to have its origins at home. The Soviet Union's course at accelerating its socio-economic development finds its logical sequence beyond its borders as well, in a large-scale programme directed at peace and disarmament. The entire approach of the CPSU and the state of the working people to international relations is imbued with the spirit of highest responsibility for the destinies of the world and a perseverant search for a way out of the difficult labyrinth of nuclear confrontation.

"We are realists and are perfectly well aware that the two worlds are divided by very many things, and deeply divided, too," said Mikhail Gorbachev in the CPSU Central Committee's Political Report to the 27th Congress. "But we also see clearly that the need to resolve most vital problems affecting all humanity must prompt them to interaction, awakening humanity's heretofore unseen powers of self-preservation".

All of the foreign policy activity of the CPSU and the Soviet government is dictated by the desire to improve world relations, and halt the arms race which through the fault of the imperialist powers swept the world. A vivid example of that is furnished by the proposals advanced in the Statement of January 15, 1986, for the complete elimination of nuclear, chemical and other types of mass destruction weapons throughout the world by the year 2000 and the new Soviet initiatives set forth in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress, which are aimed at *creating a comprehensive system of international security*. These initiatives represent a concrete and realistic programme for freeing the people of the world from the horrors and the threat of universal self-destruction, meet the deepest aspirations of all mankind. It has evoked so broad and positive a response in various countries and among all the peoples precisely because it has expressed the age-old dream of peoples concerning a stable peace and at the same time shown a genuine road to its implementation.

The world public—and this is vividly attested to by numerous responses—has seen in the thoroughly weighed Soviet proposals a *fundamentally new approach* to solving the most acute problem of today. The gist of the approach is that it is motivated not merely by concern for national

interests or national security of one state or a group of states. It is imbued in its entirety with the spirit of historical responsibility for the fate of the whole world, for safeguarding security for all, and for preserving life itself and civilization on the Earth. To achieve that goal, one had to be able to rise above the really existing contradictions between policies and ideas, to look far beyond the disagreements of today, and to see new horizons and coasts of cooperation. To this end, one had to rise above national egoism, tactical considerations, disputes and strife in order to preserve the primary asset, i. e., peace and a reliable future.

Concern over the fate of the world is incompatible with a policy aimed at preparation for war, a reliance on force. Attention must be drawn to this obvious truth only because almost daily, representatives of the US Administration make ostensible professions of peace which shroud the threats of sanctions and covert or overt interference in the internal affairs of other countries. The way of thinking of too many US politicians clearly lags behind the rapid changes transpiring in the world right before our eyes. Those politicians live in the age of computers and exploration of the galaxy but they are still thinking in terms of the Stone Age. Their philosophy of intimidation rests on the selfsame blind faith in strength, the only difference being that they rely on a nuclear missile, the more powerful the better, and on armaments, the more sophisticated the better, rather than on a long stick or a weighty rock.

Some of those politicians are not even averse to discoursing on a need for a new way of thinking in line with the new realities in the world. Yet, they persist in giving an old interpretation to everything new and look at it through the prism of the selfsame psychology of power arrogance.

This is borne out, among other things, by the approach of the elite at the helm of power in the USA to the issue of nuclear and space arms and to regional problems. It is well known that in 1982-1983 the US Administration undertook persistent attempts to secure unilateral advantages at the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms and on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe. The result of all those attempts is also well known. The White House drove the talks into a blind alley, having set about stationing first-strike Pershing 2s and cruise missiles. Subsequently, it stubbornly refused to begin talks, proposed by the USSR in 1984, on preventing the militarisation of outer space.

In an attempt to prevent the opening of a new channel for the arms race in outer space, which in turn would simply whip up the nuclear arms race on the Earth, the Soviet Union moved, in the fall of 1984, a proposal to start new talks with the United States on the whole range of nuclear and space armaments. The exchange of views resulted in an agreement on a meeting between the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs and the US Secretary of State with a view to resolving the issue of a subject and objectives of the future talks.

That was a difficult and tough talk. Till the very last moment there was no clarity as to whether the sides would reach a mutually acceptable agreement. Today, the world public knows quite well the text of that joint Soviet-American document in which each and every word is carefully weighed as if on the chemist's scales and each and every provision reflects the mutually agreed approach of the two sides to the negotiations. No overstatement or omission is permissible there for otherwise the sense of the agreement reached would change. It is all the more necessary to say this because such attempts still continue. Therefore it is worth reproducing the content of this Soviet-US statement.

During the meeting they discussed the subject and objectives of the forthcoming Soviet-US negotiations on nuclear and space arms.

The sides agree that the subject of the negotiations will be a set of questions concerning space and nuclear arms, both strategic and intermediate-range, all questions considered in their interrelationship.

The objective of the negotiations will be to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on the Earth and limiting and reducing nuclear arms and at strengthening strategic stability. The negotiations will be conducted by a delegation from each side divided into three groups.

The sides believe that ultimately the forthcoming negotiations, just as efforts in general to limit and reduce arms, should lead to the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere.

US Secretary of State deemed it necessary to give his own comments on the text of the Joint Statement (which were circulated by the US Embassy in Moscow on January 9, 1985, as an official document). It is important to note here that even then some of the State Secretary's "clarifications" bespoke a peculiar and, to put it mildly, one-sided interpretation of the Joint Statement.

For instance, he noted that the two sides were in agreement that the problems of nuclear and space arms were interrelated and that both sides attached priority to achieving radical reductions in nuclear weapons as a first step toward their complete elimination. The accents have been clearly shifted in such an interpretation of the meaning of the Statement and the "first step" in comparison with the agreement reached because the idea of interrelationship finds its expression precisely in the fact that the attainment of radical reduction in nuclear arsenals is impossible without the prevention of the arms race in space.

As to the "strategic defense initiative" (SDI) which pursues the goal of militarising outer space, the US Secretary of State jumped to its defence, so to speak, right off the bat and noted that it was fully consistent with the ABM Treaty and that no decisions to go beyond research had been made, nor could they be made for several years. This was not in conformity with the letter and spirit of the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems which says in its Article V, para. 1: "Each Party undertakes not to develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based." Since the SDI sets as its goal not some abstract fundamental research but target-oriented scientific and technological development to create space strike arms, the programme is in direct conflict with the ABM Treaty.

No less untenable was the allusion made by the Secretary of State that taking decisions that would go beyond research is allegedly a thing of the future. This is certainly not so. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, and the head of the SDI programme, Lt. Gen. James Abrahamson, were not merely more outspoken but seemed to obstruct any other interpretation of the "star wars" plans. They emphasised more than once that research under the SDI programme were inconceivable without testing and that scheduled work was proceeding much faster than intended.

Why do we go into such detail on that issue? Only to illustrate the real military and political process. Judging by many signs, in early January 1985 the US Administration went along with the agreement on beginning the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms without any great desire, forced to do so by a good many circumstances, having no intention,

which was borne out by all its actions throughout the past year, to renounce development of space strike arms within the SDI framework. Hence all the subsequent persistent attempts by many a US official to give a suitable interpretation both to the Joint Statement itself and to the SDI and the ABM Treaty. This also accounts for the blunt pronouncements made by US representatives of the top echelons of power, and primarily high-level Pentagon officials, to the effect that under any circumstances they would continue work on developing space arms. And indeed, in this particular matter there is no parting of the ways between the words and the deeds of Americans holding the reins of state power.

In analysing the course pursued by Washington after the agreement was reached on beginning the new talks on nuclear and space arms, a careful observer cannot, therefore, get rid of a dual impression. On the one hand, the US Administration, compelled to take into consideration the antiwar sentiments at home and throughout the world, declares its readiness to search for accords aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space and terminating it on the Earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear arms, and at strengthening strategic stability. On the other, in its approach to the solution of those problems the selfsame Administration ignores the vital interests of the international community. This sense of duplicity is only augmented by an ever widening gap between the political rhetoric employed, which is called upon to attribute a positive character to the proclaimed foreign policy objectives, and the essence of the real militaristic policy pursued by Washington.

Quite indicative in this regard are, in particular, the policy-making pronouncements of sorts made by the Secretary of State to a Senate Committee in January 1985 and his article in the spring issue of last year's *Foreign Affairs*. In both cases he spoke of "new realities and new ways of thinking". For us those statements were even more interesting because on January 8, on the eve of the US delegation's departure from Geneva, our book *New Thinking in the Nuclear Age* was presented to an aide of the Secretary of State, who promised to read some abstracts therefrom to his boss during the flight.

On January 31, George Shultz started off a series of hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the future of US foreign policy (his speech was circulated by the US Embassy in Moscow on February 8 as an official document).

In the beginning of his Senate statement (and, for that matter, in the beginning of his article in *Foreign Affairs*) he referred to Albert Einstein who, in the words of the Secretary of State, had drawn a conclusion that *after the dawn of the nuclear age everything had changed except our ways of thinking*. Everything would seem to be correct, including the reference to Einstein. Yet, as Voltaire used to say, the God is in details. And here is the "divine detail", namely, the words of Einstein which are alluded to but not quoted in full. Yet, what Einstein said was the following, and this quotation is represented verbatim in our book as one of the epigraphs:

A new way of human thinking is necessary for mankind to survive and to go on developing. Today, the A-bomb has fundamentally changed the world; we know that, and people find themselves in a new situation which their thinking should correspond to.

Every one is certainly free to lay his own accent while expounding an idea of a great man and drawing one's own conclusions from the pronouncements of the latter. But we are also entitled to exclaim just like the boy from one of Hans Christian Andersen's fairy tales: "But the king is naked!" A new attire for the king could not be made from the leavings of the quotation. Small wonder, for it has been so much truncated.

Those who would wish to compare the true words of Albert Einstein with those inlaid into the US State Secretary's speech would not fail to notice what has been changed there and to what end. What has been lopped off is the sting of Einstein's thought, the emphasis on the fact that *it was the A-bomb that fundamentally changed the world and this is why a new way of thinking is necessary for mankind to survive.*

It is obviously not fortuitous that such an operation has been carried out. In all likelihood, it was needed to make Albert Einstein's thesis about the need for the "new way of thinking" serve the policy of "new globalism". This is how his thought runs on: "Einstein's observation," he states moulding his interpretation as if from pliable clay, "takes on new relevance: *our ways of thinking must adapt to new realities. We must grasp the new trends and understand their implications.*" This is a surprisingly free approach but it is here for all to see.

But what is, indeed, the gist of "new trends" as George Shultz understands them? Let us listen to himself. "America after Vietnam," he said "retreated for a time from its active role of leadership.... Today, the cycle is turning again... *America has recovered its strength and self-confidence. America is again in a position to have a major influence over the trend of events*—and America's traditional goals and values have not changed. Our duty must be to help *shape* the evolving *trends* in accordance with our ideals and interests: to help build a new structure of international stability that will ensure peace, prosperity, and freedom for coming generations. This is the real challenge of our foreign policy over the coming years."

But where, if it is permitted to ask, does the new political thinking fit in? For this is nothing but "new globalism" or, in other words, the old doctrine of all-out permissiveness, proclaiming the right of the USA to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries and in the developments transpiring in any region of the world. Although occasionally one can come across a commonplace saying that "the new is the well forgotten old", this homely thought can hardly be used as a basis for comprehending the new realities of the nuclear age.

So, having begun with the call for grasping the new realities of the world and adjusting oneself thereto, Washington has arrived at a conclusion that, since the Vietnam syndrome has been "happily done away with" and the USA is once again at the crest, it is time now to begin establishing order throughout the world at its own discretion and in accordance with its own imperial notions of human morality, values and ideals.

In his speech delivered to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in early 1985 George Shultz certainly did not confine himself to simply stating but also "substantiated" the right of the United States to interfere in regional conflicts in any part of the globe. Here, the substantiation is also quite simple, namely, if the socialist countries have given and continue to give support to the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence, then why should the USA refrain from the policy of interventions? Here is an example of old, rather than new, thinking in terms of hackneyed anti-communist clichés based on the primitive concept of the ubiquitous "hand of Moscow" which official Washington sees behind every explosion of social unrest and every upsurge of the national liberation struggle in the world.

Instead of acknowledging the untenability of the old political course at backing, at first, the utterly rotten Somoza dictatorship and, subsequently, Somoza men and other contras, the US Secretary of State expresses his "new way of thinking" in the following way: "With Soviet and Cuban support, the Sandinistas are seeking to consolidate a totalitarian system in Nicaragua and to promote subversion throughout the region... Our

nation's vital interests and moral responsibility require us to stand by our friends in their struggle for freedom." Should this really mean that it was not Somoza, the butcher of the Nicaraguan people and a West Point graduate whose dictatorship was prodded by US arms and dollars till its very last days, who tried to foist the totalitarian system upon Nicaragua? What's more, today his myrmidons are portrayed as "freedom fighters" in the United States. It looks incredible but it is a fact.

This is how elevated words about the need for the "new ways of thinking" are transformed into a practice of "new globalism" based on the old thesis that "diplomacy should be backed by force". As a result, not only the year 1985 but early 1986 as well are keynoted by US support for covert and overt subversive operations executed by the contras, armed provocations against Nicaragua, and the stepped-up campaign of blackmail, threats and economic blockade launched by Washington against the courageous people of that country.

The same manifestations of the "new globalism" policy are also in evidence in other regions of the world, in the Middle East, and in southern Africa: provocations against and the trade boycott of Libya, support for the gangs of bandits operating in the territories of Angola and Afghanistan. In the meantime, US leaders persist in stressing in their statements that from the long-term perspective US policy is geared to most variegated conflicts which hold an intermediate place between a large-scale war and a universal peace. Moreover, it is added by way of explanation that Washington happens to have no plans for "living in the conditions of absolute peace. The reason for such an attitude, evidently, also lies in the "new way of thinking" but in the hawkish style.

Thus, as a result of the analysis of the developments from 1984 to early 1986 and Washington's conduct on the international scene, one is compelled to note the dual trends in US politics. On the one hand, it has shown signs of realism when the realities of the surrounding world and, first and foremost, the growing threat of nuclear war force the US President to take into account, at least partly, the dangerous evolution of the international situation. This trend, naturally, manifested itself in the most tangible fashion at the historic Geneva meeting between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and US President Ronald Reagan in November 1985. Although the summit failed to find solutions to the key issues related to the cessation of the arms race, the accords reached at Geneva by the Soviet and American leaders heralded a turn for the better both in Soviet-US relations and in the international situation as a whole.

On the other hand, many foreign policy guidelines issued by Washington still rely on the old power politics and the philosophy of intimidation. Moreover, the opponents of detente across the Atlantic bend over backwards in fanning the sentiments of blatant chauvinism (the USA prefers to speak of "new patriotism"). Believing that they are firmly ensconced in the saddle, the Pax Americana guardsmen are spurring the horse of imperial politics and are blaring the beginning of an expedition "in defense of their vital interests". But where do those interests begin and end? Many people in Washington cynically believe that those interests begin and end where they see it fit. This whole power politics, which rests on the mania of superiority, has already been christened the doctrine of "neoglobalism".

Such a duplicity in US politics cannot but inspire natural suspicion. It brings in its wake inevitable miscalculations and dangerous collisions in future. To illustrate the point, let us return to the above-quoted address by George Shultz to the Senate Committee, in which he spoke of "new realities and new ways of thinking". Referring to Soviet-American relations,

the Secretary of State, for example, said: "In the thermonuclear age the common interest in survival gives both sides an incentive to moderate the rivalry and to seek, in particular, ways to control nuclear weapons and reduce the risks of war."

This would seem a correct statement and, apparently, a good prerequisite for reaching a conclusion about the need for the "new way of thinking" in the nuclear age. But what follows thereafter? Instead of mapping out, on the basis of the shared interest in ensuring survival and lowering the danger of war, ways for limiting and reducing nuclear arms, the head of the US foreign policy department states literally in the following sentence: "We cannot know whether such a steady Western policy will, over time, lead to a *mellowing of the Soviet system*. Perhaps not." And he adds further on: "We must never let ourselves be so wedded to improving relations with the Soviets that we turn a blind eye to actions that undermine the very foundation of stable relations... Experience shows we cannot deter to undo Soviet geopolitical encroachments except by helping, in one way or another, those resisting directly on the ground."

Not only does George Shultz believe that the safeguarding of international security is possible provided the peoples refrain from the struggle for independence, and not only does he whitewash counter-revolution, no matter where it operates, but, in point of fact the Secretary of State openly acknowledges that, as he sees it, US diplomacy should strive to "mellow the Soviet system", i. e. US foreign policy should influence Soviet domestic policy. George Shultz is in no way embarrassed by the fact that this constitutes a violation of the fundamental principles of international relations. It would suffice even mentally to put the two countries in each other's place to see the utter absurdity of such an approach. What would happen if the Soviet Union, as a condition for improving relations with the United States, set as a foreign policy goal to seek changes in the American system, for instance, complete elimination of unemployment in the USA, eradication of racism, dissolution of the Ku Klux Klan, or release of political prisoners such as Leonard Peltier, a fighter for the rights of the Indians?

No less senseless is another thing, namely, to see "Soviet geopolitical encroachments" behind any conflicts in the world. According to George Shultz, "neoglobalism" means supporting everyone whom imperialism is interested in, be it the dushmans because they are fighting against revolutionary transformations in Afghanistan or Sawimbi's separatists because they are waging a war against the free Angola; or the contras of every hue who are attacking the revolutionary Nicaragua. Even such a "democrat" as Baby Doc (Jean-Claude Duvalier), the bloody tyrant and the US satrap, was taken care of by Washington literally till his very last days when he was helped to flee the country from the ire of the people.

As to arms control and talks with the USSR on this issue, the selfsame antiquated thinking in terms of the arms race is also in evidence there. "It is vital for example," says George Shultz, "to carry through with the modernization of our strategic forces—in particular the MX—to avoid undercutting our negotiators just as they begin the quest for real reductions in nuclear arms." Furthermore, the US Secretary of State has pinned particular hopes on the assumption that the pace of technological advance now opens possibilities for new ways of strategic thinking, whose crowning point, as he sees it, is the death-dealing "strategic defense initiative" when the new "wonder-weapon" will be deployed in outer space.

At the same time, the Secretary of State declares: "A world free of nuclear arms is an ultimate objective to which we, the Soviet Union, and all other nations can agree." Well, at last we hear nice words. As they say, *a moment of truth* has come, the moment when words are verified by deeds.

On January 15, 1986, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev, advanced radical and, at the same time, specific proposals, namely, to free our planet from nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000 and to reduce conventional arms and armed forces to the lowest possible level.

Those proposals have produced strong and profound impression and have been rated by the Soviet and the world public at large as the most comprehensive, serious and realistic disarmament plan which has ever been submitted for universal consideration.

We could cite dozens and hundreds pronouncements by prominent statesmen, politicians and public figures from various countries, who lauded Mikhail Gorbachev's Statement. The difference in words and intonations in those evaluations notwithstanding, enthusiasm is the predominant feeling permeating all of them. Symbolic is the statement made by Prime Minister Olof Palme of Sweden, who was villainously assassinated, at the meeting of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, which concluded in late January 1986 in New Delhi, to the effect

that the new Soviet proposals have marked the beginning of a new time in the world, the time of hope for all who cherish peace.

It stands to reason that no one in the USSR has expected that literally everyone in the world, and above all the governments of NATO countries, would forthwith accept the Soviet plan for the complete elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons over the next fifteen years. Yet, the international public has been fully justified in expecting an interested and serious attitude thereto on the part of the United States for the US Administration has repeatedly declared its commitment to the goal of completely extirpating nuclear weapons everywhere. It would seem that now Washington enjoys a practical opportunity to come to grips with this matter.

Alas, nothing of the sort! It is one thing to utter euphonious declarations about a yearning for a nuclear-free world and a need for new ways of thinking in line with the new realities. It is quite another thing to translate those good intentions into reality. The gist of *the moment of truth* is that it makes an individual, a state or the entire world community face an option as to which road to take toward a safer world: either that of further escalation of armaments or that of reductions in their arsenals.

A look at the US reply to the Soviet proposals reveals its unconstructive character. There is no solution contained in it of the main, fundamental question—preventing the arms race in space. As far as strategic and nuclear medium-range weapons are concerned, it is virtually a repetition of the old US proposal based on acquiring one-sided advantages. The openly negative position taken by the White House on the question of prohibiting nuclear weapon tests can only be understood as Washington's desire to continue the nuclear arms race.

In the situation which has taken shape, as is stressed in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress "it is not easy at all, in the current circumstances, to predict the future of the relations between the socialist and the capitalist countries, the USSR and the USA. The decisive factors here will be the correlation of forces on the

world scene, the growth and activity of the peace potential, and its capability of effectively repulsing the threat of nuclear war. Much will depend, too, on the degree of realism that Western ruling circles will show in assessing the situation. But it is unfortunate when not only the eyesight but also the soul of politicians is blind."

The moment of truth in the nuclear and space age also means not to put off taking responsible decisions. Yet, it is no longer sufficient only to wish to stave off a nuclear war or only to understand whence stems its threat. The time given by history to mankind for pondering is running out. The inhabitants of the Earth face the menace of a nuclear time-press. This is why it is imperative to act, and to act forthwith at that.

The question raised by Mikhail Gorbachev concerning a need for the "new way of political thinking" for the sake of mankind's survival requires an answer to be given not in words but in deeds. And the deeds call for a will, primarily political will.

What is *the essence of the new Soviet approach* to attaining the goal common to all humanity, that of ensuring its survival?

We knew in the past as well that peaceful coexistence and life under conditions of cooperation are the only way for the two different social systems to exist on one planet. But while before peaceful coexistence could proceed in various forms of confrontation, now—only and exclusively in the forms of peaceful competition and peaceful rivalry. At the current stage of civilisation the human community *vitaly needs a radical turn for the better, for a stable normalisation of international relations*. In other words, we all need a different level of relations, higher from the perspective of civilization, so that we all could survive.

The current stage in the development of civilisation is characterised by the fact that the quantity and quality of the weapons of mass destruction have reached an almost uncontrollable magnitude. New types of armaments, primarily space weapons, will inevitably plunge the world into the chaos of destabilisation and thus bring it to the edge of a nuclear holocaust. At the same time, the planet is also threatened by other global dangers which, if they are to be overcome, call for gigantic and, once again, concerted efforts by the entire human community. Hence, an important conclusion, namely, that in spite of all differences between the two socio-economic systems, the interrelationship and interdependence between them are so high as to urgently demand that the great art of living in peace with each other be mastered as soon as possible.

The new level of civilised international relations should exclude the approach based on arm-twisting tactics. The confrontation inevitably paves the way for a continuing arms race and heightens the risk of nuclear war. A nuclear war unleashed deliberately (the first strike) or unconsciously (a technical failure or a human miscalculation) can lead to mankind's suicide.

As has been repeatedly stated by the Soviet leadership, new thinking in the nuclear and space age means giving up the desire to impose by force one's ideology, way of thinking, and values upon others. Socialism rejects wars as a means of settling ideological disputes and interstate contradictions. Advantages of the social systems are proven by peaceful coexistence rather than by power politics. If one is to compare the Soviet and American approaches to this matter, attention will be drawn to the fact that the belief of the Soviet people in the communist future of the world (from which our opponents draw a false conclusion about expansionism) rests on a profound and comprehensive analysis of objective and subjective factors governing the world development. The new edition of the Party Programme says that "the CPSU proceeds from the belief that

the historical dispute between the two opposing social systems, into which the world is divided today, can and must be settled by peaceful means. Socialism proves its superiority not by force of arms, but by force of example in every area of the life of society". And then it once again makes reference to international relations stating that the CPSU "believes that the extension of ideological differences between the two systems to the sphere of interstate relations is inadmissible".

At the same time, contrary to the declared commitments to pluralism and "freedom of choice", the leading quarters in the United States are trying to channel the evolution of the world in accordance with their own understanding of "their interests" and "ideals". They are viewing force as an instrument to impose their will and convictions on other countries and nations. To prove the point, we are going to quote the policy-making speech delivered by US Secretary of State George Shultz in the Senate, which was ambitiously titled "The Future of American Foreign Policy: New Realities and New Ways of Thinking".

In his words, "the changes in the international system will follow the positive trends only if we—the United States and the free world—meet our responsibility to defend our interests and seek to shape events in accordance with our own ideals and goals... There is, of course, a broader issue here.... This is the basic question of the use of American power in the defense of our interests and the relevance of our power as the back-stop to our diplomacy".

This is, of course, a deeply mistaken platform, albeit so typical of the practice of US foreign policy. Elevating it to the rank of a fundamental principle means dooming international relations, through Washington's fault, to continued tensions which could escalate into a war.

According to the Soviet Union's understanding, peaceful coexistence between the two systems, as has been more than once emphasised by Soviet leaders, should safeguard peace and international security while necessarily maintaining the right of the peoples to be masters of their own destinies. Genuine international security means maintaining stability based on the military and strategic parity and abandoning the craving for superiority. Hence, in particular, our fundamental refusal to accept the "strategic defense initiative", and not because the SDI is a US project but because the desire to create the so-called "space shield" is, in essence, a project of developing new types of weapons which will destabilise the military and political situation in the world and whip up the arms race. Experts, and including US experts, acknowledge that the "space shield" can easily be used as a "space sword". And those who will be the first to take it into their possession will be tempted to put it to use. No single government, no single nation can permit that to happen. And this has been clearly declared by the Soviet Union as well.

An important measure of the "new way of thinking" is the ability to rise above ideological disputes and contradictions for the sake of reaching mutual understanding in the interests of human survival. Guided precisely by this principle, the Soviet Union in November 1985 decided to go along with the Geneva summit despite the provoking and demonstrative actions by the ultra-militaristic forces in the United States. The Soviet leadership proceeded from the belief that even the very smallest chance for radically changing the dangerous march of events in the world should not be neglected. The multifariousness of the assessments of the outcome of the Geneva summit notwithstanding, the significance of the agreements reached there on some cardinal issues is very considerable. In point of fact, a strong impetus and a fresh potentially powerful start were given to the cause of peace. This found its expression primarily in the common understanding,

recorded in the Joint Statement, that a nuclear war should never be unleashed and that it could not be won, and in the commitment of the Soviet Union and the United States to build their relations on that incontestable truth and not to seek military supremacy.

The agreement reached is also very important because, as is well known, there were no such admissions in the first years of the Reagan presidency. It was only later and as a result of the criticism of the doctrines of "limited" and "sustained" nuclear war on the part of many governments and the world public that the US President was forced to agree that "there can be no winners in a nuclear war". Recording this provision in the Joint Soviet-American Statement and giving up the yearning for military superiority give them a considerable weight of an international accord.

But it is, first and foremost, specific deeds rather than mere statements that undoubtedly constitute the main criterion of an actual position of any statesman. In this connection, it should be emphasised that a new and higher level of civilised relations on the international scene also means a high responsibility of state leaders for their policies proclaimed and translated into life.

This also presupposes, in the words of former US Senator William Fulbright, renunciation of the "power arrogance" which has deeply penetrated the psychology and philosophy of US politics. If one is to look at the President's "strategic defense initiative" from this angle, the SDI is a child born of the blatant psychology of arrogance which is dangerous not only for Americans but for all the residents of the Earth. *No single state leader has the moral right to take a unilateral decision upon which depend the destinies of world civilisation.* At the same time, it is becoming ever more obvious that the SDI has not been proclaimed just as an idea for debating. It is already being carried out in the form of a Pentagon

programme endorsed for implementation and is being put into effect in spite of affecting the vital interests of many a nation and, in the long run, the interests of the entire world community. Furthermore, taking into consideration the fact that many representatives of the top echelon of power in the United States are bluntly linking the SDI programme with plans for reaching military and strategic superiority and with expectations of dragging the USSR into a costly arms race, the "star wars" programme appears before the whole world as an embodiment of the old "way of thinking" in terms of strength and preponderance.

A logical question automatically arises as to why wouldn't Washington, following the Soviet example, take such decisions which would not impinge on anyone's interests but, on the contrary, would meet the interests of all? Why wouldn't Washington, for example, assume an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, or to cease nuclear weapons tests?

The fundamental difference between the two approaches, those of Moscow and Washington, to world affairs is clear to every objectively thinking person.

Moscow proceeds from the historical responsibility of all powers for maintaining international peace, security and strategic stability and strives to manifest its goodwill in practice. This is surely evidenced by such unilateral actions as the Soviet renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons or its moratorium on all nuclear tests, initially introduced for half a year and subsequently prolonged for another three months.

As to Washington, it has been thus far going in a different direction. It does not deem it necessary to reckon with the interests of other countries and independently takes decisions entailing far-reaching negative consequences for other countries because their security is completely discounted. If the US Administration is genuinely interested in doing away with

the nuclear weapons as has been declared by President Reagan, it would surely be logical to discuss this problem with those directly concerned rather than make the world face a de facto decision about the SDI.

Today, when people in the world compare the two plans for eliminating nuclear weapons, the Gorbachev Plan and the Reagan Plan, they inevitably stress the fundamentally different approaches of the USA and the USSR to this issue. While Ronald Reagan is dreaming of developing new strike weapons in outer space to be used against nuclear weapons on the Earth, Mikhail Gorbachev proposes to eliminate nuclear weapons without creating space arms. These are two different patterns of political thinking: "going to peace" by chaotically piling up armaments, or achieving peace by eliminating the weapons of mass destruction. Another fundamental difference between these two approaches is that while Ronald Reagan has taken his SDI decision, in fact, unilaterally, Mikhail Gorbachev suggests that all countries discuss and jointly set about eliminating the existing nuclear weapons.

The Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress reads: "In the years to come, the struggle will evidently centre on the actual content of the policy that can safeguard peace. It will be a hard and many-sided struggle, because we are dealing with a society whose ruling circles refuse to assess the realities of the world and its perspectives in sober terms, or to draw serious conclusions from their own experience and that of others."

Many Western, in particular American, politicians and military experts perceive the meaning of the SDI—and this is self-evident to us, Soviet people—in attaining military and strategic supremacy over the USSR with the aid of space armaments. All the talk about the SDI as a "defense shield" is nothing but deception. It is indicative that nowadays as well the United States itself is not reducing but building up its nuclear weapons and is developing, according to Assistant Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy Richard Wagner, new warheads with new characteristics. This is yet another reason for the USA's reluctance to give up nuclear testing. Furthermore, Americans themselves acknowledge that nuclear weapons within the SDI framework can readily be used as an offensive weapon. According to *International Herald Tribune* of January 13, 1986, "laser weapons being developed as part of the Strategic Defense Initiative could more easily be used to incinerate enemy cities than to protect the United States against Soviet missiles". This is the gist of a study carried out in the United States.

The Soviet plan for eliminating nuclear weapons, advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev on January 15, 1986, offers an honest and businesslike approach to doing away with nuclear armaments on an honest and fair basis without inflicting damage on any single country, including the United States, and without creating new problems.

Thus, if the peaceable rhetoric of the US Administration's representatives were to be subjected to a critical analysis, comparing their words and deeds, then their "new way of thinking", as we have been able to see for ourselves, turn into "new globalism" and a most dangerous destabilisation of international relations.

To think in a new fashion in the nuclear and space age does not only mean to proclaim that we are living in an interdependent world. This means to acknowledge in practice that it is not permissible, even behind the screen of most noble intentions, to seek to safeguard only one's own security without due regard for the security of other states. On that score Mikhail Gorbachev has stated in no uncertain terms: "I think that in order to bring about a real turn in our relations, which would meet the interests of the USSR and the USA, the interests of the peoples of the

world, new approaches, a fresh look at many things and, what is most important, political will on the part of the leadership of the two countries are needed. The USSR—and I emphasised that in Geneva—has no enmity towards the United States, and respects the American people. We are not building our policy on a desire to encroach on the national interests of the United States. What is more: we would not want, for instance, a change in the strategic balance in our favour. We would not want that because such a situation will heighten suspicion on the other side and also increase the instability of the overall situation."

And surely the selfsame wishes to strengthen stability and security on the European continent motivate the Soviet proposals to eliminate at the first stage of the nuclear disarmament programme all ballistic and cruise missiles of the USSR and the USA in the European zone.

To think in a new fashion means to think not only about oneself and one's allies but to see the interrelationship between disarmament and development and to propose ways for resolving the global problems facing humanity. As has been said by Mikhail Gorbachev in his Statement, "initiating active steps to halt the arms race and reduce weapons is a necessary prerequisite for coping with the increasingly acute global problems, those of the deteriorating human environment and of the need to find new energy sources and combat economic backwardness, hunger and disease".

In accordance with these provisions, the letter of January 27, 1986, addressed by the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, Eduard Shevardnadze, to UN Secretary-General Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, transmitted the Memorandum of the USSR Government on International Economic Security: an Important Condition for Healthy International Economic Relations. The Memorandum stresses that the "pattern imposed by militarism—arms instead of development—must be replaced by the reverse order of things—disarmament for development".

In advancing its proposals for eliminating nuclear, chemical and any other type of weapons of mass destruction and reducing the conventional potentials, the Soviet Union draws the attention of all the peoples and governments to the need for specific and prompt actions by all the forces of peace. "The imperative condition for success in resolving the topical issues of international life," the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress stresses, "is to reduce the time of search for political understandings and to secure the swiftest possible constructive action."

The Soviet Union is doing everything possible to check the nuclear arms race. In answer to a joint message sent to the USA and the USSR by the leaders of Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden and Greece appealing to those countries to refrain from carrying out any nuclear testing until the next summit meeting is held, Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized that the time extension granted to the US Administration, for weighing the USSR's proposals, is running out. We cannot indefinitely extend this offer on a unilateral basis. Having refrained from carrying out any nuclear explosions for 8 months—neither testing nor peaceful explosions—we have already run into a few costs—both militarily and economically. In addition, he continued, "in response to your appeal addressed to the USSR and the USA to refrain from any nuclear tests in the period till the next Soviet-American summit we declare: *The Soviet Union will not carry out nuclear explosions even after March 31—till the first nuclear explosion by the USA*".

Doing everything necessary in order to make the solution of the problem of nuclear testing a reality—and in a broader sense—the elimi-

nation of nuclear arsenals—the USSR is consolidating the positions of all the planet's peace-loving forces.

This is all the more important because influential forces of imperialism stand in the way of disarmament, the forces for which new armaments have always been a source of profits, influence and power. The military-industrial complex—and former US President Dwight Eisenhower warned his fellow-countrymen against its dangerous influence in the early 1960s—is a horde of insatiable monsters with multi-billion-dollar assets and with the powerful tentacles of lobbyists, penetrating all the spheres of US society. Using all their influence, power and money, they are poisoning and lulling public consciousness for the sake of developing, manufacturing and deploying wherever possible, be it on the Earth or in air, on the seas, under water, or even in outer space, ever more sophisticated new weapons. The very philosophy of peace without armaments is calimitous to them, which is why they are imposing the philosophy of "peace thanks to new weapons", which is beneficial only to them.

In this tremendous battle between the two opposing systems of views, the proponents of the old arms-twisting methods are prepared for anything in order to justify their policy of "new globalism". They are ready to quote Albert Einstein ignoring his passionate appeal for rejecting the atom bomb. They are donning the mantle of champions of "new thinking" and are capable of any mimicry in the name of procrastinating the cause of real disarmament. They know that so far they have had an ally in the inertness of human thinking and the lagging of the consciousness of still too many people behind the rapid changes in the patterns of life. This phenomenon has always served as an obstacle to refraining from using weapons as a means of settling disputes.

The need for awareness of the global dangers looming over mankind in the nuclear and space age and the objective need for new political thinking are growing to become the urgent imperatives of our time. Mankind should not only ensure its own survival but also to pass to future generations all the spiritual and material riches of our civilisation.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English Translation Copyright: Progress Publishers 1986

/9317

CSO: 5200/1490

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

RENMIN RIBAO VIEWS U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR TALKS

HK301546 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 29 Jul 86 p 6

["News Explanation" by Fang Min: "The Two Nuclear Talks Currently Held in Geneva Between the United States and the Soviet Union"]

[Text] During the last 10 days of July, the United States and the Soviet Union will be holding two talks in Geneva on the question of nuclear weapons. One of the talks will be a special meeting of the U.S.-Soviet Permanent Consultation Committee, which on 22 July will begin to discuss the disputes over the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty; another talk will be the U.S.-Soviet experts meeting which will begin on 25 July to discuss the question of nuclear testing. The reason that the United States and the Soviet Union are holding the two talks is because the two sides have recently had heated disputes over the two questions. However, on the other hand, that both sides have agreed to hold talks shows that both sides now want to ease up the tension in their relations.

The U.S.-Soviet Permanent Consultation Committee has long been established in accordance with the U.S.-Soviet anti-ballistic missiles treaty signed by the two countries in 1972. Its main functions are to deal with questions concerning the observance of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty and other technical questions concerning arms control. According to the stipulations of the treaty, the U.S.-Soviet Permanent Consultation Committee holds two regular meetings every year. The next regular meeting will be held at the end of September of this year. This special meeting is held according to the demand of the Soviet Union.

Over the past 2 months, the United States and the Soviet Union have had heated disputes on whether the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty should be scrapped or not. On 27 May, Ronald Reagan declared in a policy statement that the United States will no longer be bound by the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty at the end of this year because the Soviet Union has long violated the treaty and the United States can no longer have its hands tied. The Soviet Union has also declared that the wanton scrapping of the treaty by the United States is aimed at expanding its nuclear arms and seeking unilateral superiority. If the United States really scraps the treaty, the Soviet Union will also adopt necessary measures to prevent the strategic equilibrium from being damaged. The Soviet Union has declared that it has not violated the treaty and that the American accusation against the Soviet Union is to find excuses for its own violation of the treaty. The heated disputes between the United States and the Soviet Union have caused serious concern around the world. Both the people inside the United States and the

West European countries have expressed concern over Reagan's announcement and hoped that the Reagan administration will act cautiously. At the same time, in June this year, the Soviet Union also put forward an "intermediate plan" for arms control and expressed some flexibility on arms control. Under such circumstances, in order to ease up the tension in their bilateral relations, both sides have decided to hold talks to discuss the question of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty. However, both sides have different interests in this talk, so it seems that there will certainly be disputes between the two sides during the talk. The official spokesman for the U.S. Government has said that the representatives of the United States will expound on the U.S. position on the treaty and at the same time, demand that the Soviet Union explain its violation of the treaty while the Soviet Union has said that the Soviet Union will address inquiries to the United States.

As far as the talk on the question of nuclear testing is concerned, the situation is relatively complicated. The attitudes of both the United States and the Soviet Union are always based on their respective needs for developing nuclear weapons. The situation in past negotiations on nuclear testing, in which the United States and the Soviet Union were the chief rivals, showed that both the treaty on partial prohibition of nuclear testing which was signed in 1963 and the treaty on restricting the scale of underground nuclear testing which was signed in 1974 only prohibited the nuclear testing which both countries no longer carry out. What is more, because there have been a lot of problems and differences which cannot be solved between the two sides, the negotiations on nuclear testing have been suspended for many years. Over the past year, the Soviet Union has repeatedly proposed that both sides stop nuclear testing. And beginning last August, the Soviet Union has several times extended the term of its unilateral suspension of nuclear testing, demanding the United States to follow suit and express more flexibility on the question of verifying nuclear tests. However, the United States did not agree to the Soviet proposal on suspending nuclear testing. The disarmament agency of the United States has stated the position of the United States on the question of nuclear testing by making it clear that the overall prohibition of nuclear testing is a long-term goal of the United States, but this goal cannot be realized in the near future. The United States stated that from 1976 to 1985, the Soviet Union carried out altogether 190 underground nuclear tests, which, generally speaking, have already satisfied the Soviet needs while the United States still needs to rely on nuclear tests to increase the reliability of its nuclear deterrent force. As a result, during the year the Soviet Union suspended its nuclear tests, the United States, on the contrary, carried out more than 10 nuclear tests. Although this time, the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to hold a talk, they have different aims at the talk. The Soviet Union has said that the talk must discuss such questions as supervision and verifying nuclear tests and looking for measures for safely giving up nuclear testing while the United States has insisted on centering the talk on nuclear testing on improving the verification of nuclear tests. It seems that the two talks will not go smoothly.

/8309

CSO: 5200/4060

SALT/START ISSUES

SOVIET PAPER RIDICULES PERLE COMMENTS ON SOVIET VIOLATIONS

Moscow GUDOK in Russian 4 Jul 86 p 3

[Article by N. Novlyanskiy: "The Pearls of Mr Perle"]

[Text] A sharp-tongued American journalist christened U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle the "Prince of Darkness". An inordinately splendiferous title, perhaps, but it has to be mentioned that Perle jumps up really like the devil from the snuffbox each time discussion has barely begun about the United States' relations with the Soviet Union, and with a single purpose, what is more: slandering those who would like an improvement in these relations and injecting some poison and adding calumny and other seasoning which, as they say, are popular in the devil's kitchen.

Now, when Washington is sailing under full sail away from Geneva, Mr Perle's inventions are in great demand in certain American publications. Thus he was recently accorded the pages of THE WASHINGTON POST. The journalists inquired primarily about the reasons why the administration had decided to bury the SALT Treaty. The assistant secretary was not about to trouble himself with reflection: "The Russians are violating it." In what respect? "I expect that at any time in the near future additional new types of ICBM's will probably appear," "in my opinion, in spite of SALT II, the Soviet Union will build fifth-generation ICBM's." "Expectations" and "probabilities" are now valuable commodities in Washington, they are used instead of facts.

With a basketful of these goods Perle appeared in the editorial office of the journal DEFENSE NEWS. Many people in the United States are now worried by the consequences of America's abandonment of generally recognized agreements. After all, Moscow has said clearly: if the United States does this, all the accords recorded therein will cease to have effect. There will be no restrictions for us also either in terms of the number of delivery systems or the number of warheads.

And hereupon comforting assurances are heard: "I believe... there will be no appreciable difference between the total arsenal of Soviet forces with SALT II and the total arsenal thereof in the absence of the SALT II limitations... the main difference will probably be reflected in a decision not to dismantle some of the oldest, most obsolete and most inefficient systems." We would note that in conversation with the editors of THE WASHINGTON POST Perle claimed that in abandoning SALT the United States did not intend increasing its military power thanks to the lifting of the restrictions. But now let anyone try and make sense

of this logic. Consequently, while the United States was complying with the treaties the USSR was developing "three or four new types of missiles" and thereby threatening America. But were it to flout its commitments, we would just leave in place any old things, and nothing terrible will happen.

Evidently both the newspaper and the journal sensed the fragility of Perle's constructions and swiftly moved on to the subject of the concern of the allies at the administration's recent decisions. Hereupon the Pentagon figure, who, it is said, while yet a student of the London School of Economics and Political Sciences championed "true Americanism" in the face of the spinelessness of his European schoolfellows, felt strong and brought the metal crashing down:

"The Europeans are simply renowned for constantly ignoring treaty violations. This tendency to display totally unwarranted reverence for this mature European diplomacy has led twice in our century to world wars.

"I do not know what the Danes or Norwegians or Germans could do to persuade the Russians to observe treaty commitments. It seems to me that they have essentially done very little."

And a candid confession: "this decision could in no way have been made acceptable to the Europeans."

The DEFENSE NEWS reports Perle as "head of a kind of mini-State Department in the Pentagon". The State Department is, as is known, the department formulating foreign policy, and inasmuch as the Pentagon is today manifestly the leader among the other American departments the role of "furious Richard" is of considerable importance. On which the Americans and their allies can hardly be congratulated.

8850

CSO: 5200/1469

SALT/START ISSUES

SOVIET COLONEL REBUTS U.S. ARGUMENTS ON SALT II CEILINGS

LD142159 Moscow World Service in English 1610 GMT 14 Jul 86

[Colonel Nikita Chaldimor commentary]

[Excerpts] Significantly, at a time of the signing of the SALT II treaty, its opponents used to declare that it was unacceptable since its ceilings on strategic weapons were too high. The Reagan administration took advantage of that argument to motivate its opposition to the treaty's ratification. Now the same administration intends to scrap the treaty, which it pledged to stand by even without its ratification, as the limits set by the treaty have become too low in the opinion of American officials.

What has actually happened? The American side put the blame on the Soviet Union, claiming that in defiance of the agreements, the Soviet Union has left the United States far behind in terms of strategic weapons. This is a false claim from beginning to end. In reality there exists an approximate parity in strategic weapons between the Soviet Union and the United States. That parity was verified in the course of the 7-year long preparations of the SALT II treaty, and was registered officially by the leaders of the two countries during its signing in 1979. Since then the number of strategic delivery vehicles available on each side has not changed. The Soviet Union has slightly more of them, 2,505 units, and the United States 2,210. But the United States instead is ahead of the Soviet Union in the number of warheads. So on the whole there is an approximate balance.

To prevent a rise in the strategic arms limits set by the treaty, the Soviet Union has dismantled some 250 strategic weapons. They include 182 ballistic missile launchers on submarines and also a great number of intercontinental missiles and heavy bombers.

Concretely, the United States has scheduled its withdrawal from the SALT II treaty for the end of the current year, when in the process of deploying new weapons, including heavy bombers with cruise missiles, the United States will exceed the set limit of 1,320 units for strategic carriers equipped with multiple individually targeted warheads.

Washington is threatening to renounce another major agreement with the Soviet Union, the 1972 treaty of unlimited duration, restricting the systems of antimissile defense, which is becoming an obstacle to the United States program of Star Wars. One conclusion can be made: when faced with a choice whether to hold back its own armaments programs or to open the door to an uncontrolled arms race, Washington preferred the latter. The present American leadership is making an exceptionally dangerous move which threatens to destroy a treaty system curbing the arms race in nuclear armaments and thereby creating conditions for the conclusion of new agreements.

It is natural that the Soviet Government, as it has said in its statement, will not remain indifferent watching the United States breaking the existing agreement on restricting strategic offensive weapons. The American side should not have any illusions that it will succeed in attaining military advantages for itself at the expense of the security of others.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1497

SALT/START ISSUES

SOVIET PAPER REBUTS, RETURNS SALT VIOLATION CHARGE

PM251530 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jul 86 p 3

[Article by A. Kortunov, senior scientific staffer at the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute, under the rubric "Pharisees of the 20th Century": "This Long, Long Lie..."]

[Text] Treaties must be observed. Does it sound like an axiom? Historians have estimated that in the past 3,000 years more than 8,000 international treaties have been signed "for all time," treaties that soon ceased to meet the interests of one of the sides and were observed for an average of no more than two years.

Mankind learns from his mistakes. Today it is clear to any sensible person that treaties must be observed, that treacherous behavior in international affairs generates distrust and distrust leads to confrontation.

Alas, common sense does not always overcome the inertia of political thinking. New evidence of this is U.S. President Reagan's statement that in the future the U.S. will not base its decisions pertaining to strategic forces on the criteria contained in the SALT II treaty. As well as making this decision, the White House sent a report to Congress attempting to demonstrate that observance of SALT II has lost its meaning since, it is claimed, the USSR "flagrantly and systematically" violates its basic provisions.

Moreover, in their speeches in recent months leading figures in the current administration have been pushing the idea that the Soviet Union does not recognize any treaties at all and systematically violates them. Without exception...

Perhaps, since it was making such serious charges, the White House had substantial grounds? Over to the experts.

George Kennan, former U.S. ambassador to the USSR and a leading expert in the sphere of relations between the two countries:

"Certain people are questioning the possibility of trusting the Soviet government to fulfill international agreements. Such doubts always amaze me -- we have the experience of 6 and 1/2 decades, and the answer provided by this experience is perfectly clear. It is possible to conclude mutually advantageous agreements with the Soviet side. The USSR will respect them..."

Alexander Haig, general and former U.S. secretary of state:

"According to all the data we have at our disposal, the Soviet Union is carrying out the provisions of existing treaties on strategic arms limitation."

The U.S. stance on SALT II has always been distinctly ambiguous. It is true that the administration has repeatedly declared its intention to observe the spirit and letter of the treaty. For example, when adopting the new ballistic missile-armed nuclear submarines the President even gave the order to dismantle obsolete submarines in order not to exceed the limits laid down in SALT II. But the White House has invariably stressed that observance of the SALT II provisions is secondary; implementation of U.S. strategic programs comes first!

In fact, the SALT II erosion process began immediately after it was signed. The U.S. deployment of long-range sea- and land-based cruise missiles was an obvious violation of its provisions (matters relating to this category of strategic armaments should, according to the protocol to the SALT II treaty, have been tackled on the basis of reciprocity on the expiry of the protocol, but the U.S. side would not discuss the question). The program to create a second new type of ICBM (as well as the MX) -- Midgetman -- is also a violation of SALT II.

It would not be so bad if the administration was only violating the provisions of the SALT II treaty. But its policy signifies a gradual enfeeblement of practically all the agreements concluded between the USSR and the United States in the last decade and many multilateral agreements signed by the United States. The very implementation of President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative" program signifies the undermining of such important multilateral agreements as the 1977 convention prohibiting military or any other hostile use of means of modifying the environment and the 1967 treaty on the principles of states' activity in the study and use of space, including the moon and other celestial bodies.

The President, if anyone, must be aware that Washington's entire current military-political strategy is a most flagrant violation of the letter and spirit of the treaties and agreements signed by the United States during the detente years. Including the SALT II treaty. Now this violation is being elevated to "official" status...

The administration is not deterred even by the fact that many of the agreements it is now abandoning limit Soviet strategic programs more than they do U.S. ones. It is well-known, for example, that the Soviet Union dismantled 540 strategic delivery vehicles under the SALT I Interim Agreement and the SALT II treaty, whereas the United States dismantled only 168. These obvious pluses no longer satisfy the administration, since its ambitions extend much further: It is clearly intent on attaining overall strategic military superiority over the USSR and discrediting the very process of arms limitation and reduction.

It is hardly accidental that the fanning of various rumors about alleged violation of Soviet-American treaties and agreements by the USSR and the use of sources of information that are clearly biased and known to be dishonest and, sometimes, of blatant fabrications always coincides with the confirmation of the Pentagon's new military programs.

At the very time when, in spring 1981, reports first began to appear in the Western press of Soviet violations of SALT II and SALT I, emanating from certain "sources close to the White House," the programs for the creation of MX missiles, the new B-1B

and Stealth strategic bombers, the new Ohio-class submarines, and long-range cruise missiles were being hastily pushed through on Capitol Hill.

At the very time when, in the spring 1983, the U.S. press was making a fuss about imaginary Soviet violations of the 1972 Treaty on Limiting ABM Systems, the Pentagon was actually seeking a sharp increase in appropriations for the development [razrabotka] of various space weapons systems.

Will this ruse work again? The U.S. Congress also learns from its mistakes, and in recent years it has been less and less keen to approve the administration's military programs and has been increasingly pressing for real advances in the disarmament sphere. The cock-and-bull stories about the Soviet Union's "flagrant violations" of treaties and agreements are no longer given much credence even on Capitol Hill. Even less credence is given to them by statesmen in the capitals of the West European countries, the U.S. NATO allies. There is even less faith in the administration on the part of those whose support it particularly needs -- ordinary Americans.

And nothing and no one -- not the mighty military-industrial complex, nor the eloquence of the President himself, nor the strident propaganda campaigns in the press -- is going to help restore this belief in the White House. "Once you have lied, who is going to believe you?" Kozma Prutkov quite correctly asked. Indeed, a lie 5 years long can turn even the most naive simpleton into a hardened skeptic.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1497

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: FURTHER REPORTS ON STANDING CONSULTATIVE COMMISSION

Charges, Countercharges

OW270430 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1045 GMT 24 Jul 86

[From "The World Today" Program presented by Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Text] The session of the Standing Soviet-U.S. Consultative Commission, which was convened in 1972 for solving problems arising in the course of implementing arms control agreements, which opened in Geneva on 22 July, is continuing its work.

When the Soviet Union and the United States signed the treaty on limiting offensive strategic arms -- its abbreviated form, SALT II -- in 1979, the Permanent Consultative Commission began to address questions related to this treaty. The current commission's session is devoted to the specific topic of President Reagan's stated intention to abandon the SALT II accord. Session participants have agreed to hold confidential talks, and for this reason I will guess what they are talking about, but it is quite possible to characterize the U.S. position regarding SALT II. I remind you that the United States signed this treaty, has not ratified it, but has agreed to observe its provisions.

The Soviet Union considers the SALT II accord a valid document, despite its formal expiration date of 31 December 1985. The meaning of the treaty lies in the following: It limits the deployment of strategic strike forces by placing limitations on ICBM's with MIRV warheads and long-range bombers and their armaments. Now the United States says it wants to abandon the treaty, and justifies this by the fact that it has not been ratified and by the fact that the Soviet Union has reduced it to a piece of paper by its treaty violations. I will talk about U.S. charges later.

Now I will point out the real reason why the U.S. wants to destroy the SALT II accord. Its framework has simply begun to hinder the further expansion of the Washington administration's arms race. Specifically, reequipping long-range B-52 bombers with cruise missiles carrying nuclear warheads, on an average of one aircraft every three weeks, will lead to the United States' exceeding the set limits by December.

The United States has decided to abandon the SALT II accord in order not to stop the realization of the plan for reequipping bombers.

Now, concerning charges against the Soviet Union:

Charge No 1: The USSR has deployed ICBM's not of just one new type, as permitted by the treaty, but two new types. This is not true. The SS-25 missile, the one mentioned by the United States, is just a modification of an old missile.

Charge No 2: The USSR is encoding telemetry data during ballistic missiles tests and this is prohibited by the treaty. Again, this is a lie. No encoding is done on telemetry data, which the U.S. must know in order to monitor our observance of the treaty.

At the same time, there are instances of violations committed by the U.S. side. In addition to MX missiles permitted by the treaty, the United States is developing another new type, the Midgetman. The United States is concealing the construction of ballistic missile launching silos and forbidding the Soviet Union to monitor this work with the aid of our national technical means and this violates the SALT II accord. Finally, by deploying Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Europe, which the USSR regards as strategic missiles, the United States has committed another violation of the treaty.

This is the attitude that prevails at the Permanent Soviet-U.S. Consultative Commission Session being held in Geneva. I will not forecast its outcome. I will just say that the U.S. position is certainly influenced by the following consideration: Abandonment of the SALT II accord by the United States will lead to an increase in expenditures by a minimum of \$126 million for new strategic arms systems in the coming decade. Can U.S. military corporations pass up such a fat morsel? This is why they are demanding that the administration abandon the SALT II accord.

Words, Deeds Contrasted

OW260526 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 25 Jul 86

[Boris Parkhomenko commentary from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The U.S. Administration is stubbornly opposing efforts to reach an agreement to end the arms race.

[Parkhomenko] Hello comrades. Two successive events have drawn intent, but far from mild, reaction from the world community.

An extraordinary session of the Soviet-U.S. Standing Consultative Commission created for promoting and implementing the aims and provisions of the ABM Treaty, agreements to limit offensive strategic weapons, and also the agreement on measures to reduce the danger of nuclear war arising between the USSR and the United States, opened in Geneva 2 days ago as a result of USSR efforts.

After agreeing to go to the conference table, U.S. members of the commission publicized this gesture as allegedly irrefutable proof of U.S. adherence to the idea of detente, of constructive cooperation in the field of disarmament.

Well, such a statement could only be welcomed if there had not been a second event, which occurred just one day after the first. The printing ink had hardly dried on the pages of U.S. newspapers reporting on the new U.S. demonstration of goodwill, when it was announced that another nuclear device -- the eighth this year, and the 15th since the Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests -- had been exploded at the testing range in Nevada.

This extremely wide divergence between the Washington administration's words and deeds has caused complete confusion among the most devoted U.S. allies. The world community saw it as a challenge to world public opinion.

Unfortunately, these explosions in Nevada, and not at all the statements about their readiness to strive jointly with the USSR for the liquidation of nuclear arsenals, prove the true intentions of the White House to continue to sabotage all efforts leading to an end to the arms race.

Session Ends

LD301344 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 30 Jul 86

[Text] Geneva July 30 TASS -- The extraordinary session of the Soviet-American Permanent Consultative Commission has closed here today. The commission was set up to promote the implementation of the aims and provisions of the treaty on the limitation of ABM systems, agreements in the field of limitation of strategic offensive arms and also an agreement on measures to lessen the risk of outbreak of a nuclear war between the USSR and the USA.

In the course of the session, the attention of the American side was drawn to the extremely dangerous consequences of the refusal of the USA to observe the interim agreement (SALT-1) and the SALT-2 agreement and the need to take effective measures that would make it possible to halt the process of destruction of the contractual system to contain the nuclear weapons race.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1497

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS REPORTS 'SECRET' U.S. STEALTH FLIGHTS OVER EUROPE

LD241131 Moscow TASS in English 1128 GMT 24 Jul 86

[Text] Washington July 24 TASS - by TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko: The American military is using air space over Europe for secret tests of its advanced "Stealth" planes. The indications that such flights were under way appeared lately in the American press. According to the newspaper, DEFENSE NEWS, Western European countries came out time and again with the suppositions that an advanced American F-19 fighter plane, practically invisible to radars, was slying sorties from the British airbase at Mildenhall.

The Americans feel at home there. It is from that base that the American F-111 bombers left for their piratic raid on Libya. According to DEFENSE NEWS, the Stealth planes were probably secretly delivered to the air base on board U.S. military transport aircraft, and then used for reconnaissance flights at night or in bad weather over targets too dangerous to risk losing more vulnerable spy planes, such as U-2 or SR-71.

The paper did not indicate what dangerous targets the newest spy plane was flying over. The dense shroud of secrecy over the programme of developing the Stealth plane was raised for the second time in the past days. On July 11, this year, it was reported in the press that a Stealth plane crashed in California. According to the CBS Television Network, it was carrying sophisticated electronic equipment making it practically invisible to radar. The CBS reported that 20-30 Stealth planes were deployed at the Nellis airbase and flew sorties only at night or in bad weather. One cannot rule out the possibility that these planes are being used for spying missions in Europe.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1497

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: FRG COMMUNISTS DEMAND REMOVAL OF U.S. MISSILES

LD242109 Moscow TASS in English 1717 GMT 24 Jul 86

[Text] Bonn July 24 TASS -- "The Communists of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) demand that the U.S. nuclear missiles be removed from the country's territory, that their tests be banned, that militarisation of outer space be prevented, that chemical weapons be eliminated, and that the armed forces and armaments in Europe be reduced", said Ellen Weber, deputy chairman of the German Communist Party (GCP). She spoke at a press conference in Bonn today when presenting the GCP's political document -- a "peace charter" -- to those present.

"We regard the charter as the foundation of a new policy in the field of security which the FRG's government ought to pursue with due regard for national and European interests of ensuring peace, disarmament and relaxation of tension", Ellen Weber said.

The deputy chairman of the GCP said that the "peace charter" has been sent by the party's leadership to the Federal Chancellor's Office, as well as to all party groups in the Bundestag. The GCP is for the document to acquire the force of a federal law of the FRG.

"The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, the moratorium which the Soviet Union has extended several times, is an evidence of the USSR's peaceableness and of its striving for an end to the arms race which is ruinous to everyone and for an improvement of the international situation", Ellen Weber has stated in an interview with a TASS correspondent.

"The Communists of the FRG are indignant at the fact that the ruling circles of the United States, ignoring the demands of the international public, stubbornly refuse to join the Soviet moratorium and, instead, continue nuclear explosions", she went on to say.

"Such an approach is the USA's challenge to the entire international community", Ellen Weber emphasized.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1498

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA ALLEGES U.S. PLANS TO DEPLOY NEUTRON WARHEADS IN FRG

PM310949 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jul 86 First Edition p 5

[Vladislav Drobkov "Commentator's Column": "By the Back Door..."]

[Text] The revelations published in Britain's THE OBSERVER newspaper the other day give new grounds for serious concern. It is a question of the secret deployment in the FRG of a new type of American nuclear warhead. They are large-caliber artillery shells, considerably superior in terms of range and a number of other tactical characteristics to those already in the armory of the North Atlantic bloc troops. The warheads are designed in such a way that they can be rapidly converted into neutron shells, which have the capability to destroy all living things.

As is known, these barbaric weapons have been created in the United States in the last decade. They were intended for deployment in the "European theater," where population density is high. Their destruction factors, from the standpoint of misanthropic logic, could there be used with exceptional "effectiveness." Neutron warheads, according to the Pentagon's designs, were destined for the armory of the American troops stationed in Western Europe and the armies of the NATO allies.

However, a mighty wave of protest from the West Europeans against Washington's dangerous venture thwarted these plans. The last U.S. Administration was forced to renounce large-scale production of neutron warheads. It appeared that the allies' concern had at least had some effect on determining Washington's military strategy. But that was not so. Soon the United States began the production and stockpiling of neutron weapon components. As the Pentagon admits, these components could be rapidly shipped to Europe "in the event of a crisis."

The stipulation "in the event of a crisis," as is now becoming clear, was used with the aim of lulling the West Europeans' vigilance. The impression was created that the delivery of neutron warheads to Europe was not very likely. But now THE OBSERVER has produced evidence that the first components for neutron charges -- the W79 nuclear artillery shells -- have already been shipped into the FRG. Moreover, according to the newspaper, the Americans are foisting them on their NATO allies on the sly. "European parliaments," THE OBSERVER notes, "are not being kept informed about the negotiations."

Well, this "caution" on the part of the Pentagon is understandable. The United States cannot have forgotten the alarm and indignation of the public, who have barred the way to neutron weapons once before. The attempt to bring them in, so to speak, "by the back door" shows that the hotheads in the United States have still not given up the crazy scenario of a neutron drama in Europe.

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

BRIEFS

TASS: TURKISH AIDE ON U.S. DUMPS--Ankara, 12 Jul--At the moment there are U.S. nuclear weapon dumps at four military airfields in Turkey--Malatya, (Myurtede), Balikesir, and Eskisehir. There is a similar dump at the U.S. Air Force base at Incirlik, a Turkish Foreign Ministry spokesman said. In addition, there are four squadrons of F-4 and F-104 aircraft deployed here, equipped for "alert status" with nuclear weapons on board. Medium-range howitzers equipped with nuclear-tipped shells can also be found in Turkey. Commenting on the U.S. Defense Department's appeal to Congress for appropriations for the construction of new dumps for U.S. nuclear weapons in eight countries, including Turkey, the Foreign Ministry spokesman pointed out that as regards Turkish-American military facilities "in joint use," this matter is being examined with a view to "modernizing" existing weapons and equipment. [TASS report: "The Turkish Foreign Ministry's Viewpoint"] [Text] [Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Jul 86 First Edition p 5 PM] /12858

TASS ON UK POLARIS TESTS--London, 26 July TASS--One of the four British nuclear-power submarines staying 33 miles off Cape Canaveral conducted two trial launchings of Polaris missiles, the British Defense Office said. The tests of the nuclear-capable missiles were carried out under a program to modernize Britain's nuclear forces. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 26 Jul 86 LD] /12858

CSO: 5200/1498

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR'S ISRAELYAN CRITICIZES WESTERN APPROACH AT CD

PM291033 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with V.L. Israelyan, head of Soviet delegation at Geneva Conference on Disarmament, by own correspondent V. Kuznetsov dispatch: "Taking Account of the New Realities"]

[Text] Geneva -- The Conference on Disarmament is continuing its work at the Palais des Nations. At plenary sessions and in working parties, the representatives of 40 delegations are examining the problems involved in ending the arms race and drafting documents that could form the basis for the adoption of important decisions in the sphere of implementing a program of general and complete disarmament. What are the features of the present session?

"The mood of the 1986 session," Soviet delegation head V.L. Israelyan told your correspondent, "has indisputably been set by the Soviet Union's peace initiatives, which have focused the world community's attention on key problems of international relations such as limiting the nuclear arms race, nuclear disarmament, preventing an arms race in outer space, and banning nuclear weapons tests. [paragraph continues]

The speeches made by the vast majority of state delegations taking part in the conference show their understanding of the USSR's constructive initiatives aimed at reversing the increasingly dangerous race to nuclear catastrophe and moving toward disarmament. However, it has not yet been possible to start constructive talks on these questions at the conference. There is only one reason for this -- a lack of political will and readiness for talks on the part of the U.S. and other Western delegations.

"For example," the head of the Soviet delegation continued, "let us take a paramount question like banning nuclear weapon tests -- which, incidentally, has been on the conference agenda for many years now. The Soviet Union advocates immediately beginning talks on banning such tests completely and is ready for any form of talks, including a conference, and any version of an accord. This readiness is demonstrated in action. Our country has repeatedly extended its unilateral moratorium declared on 6 August last.

"There is also a sound material basis for multilateral dialogue. A Soviet draft treaty on general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, a Swedish draft in similar vein, and several dozen proposals by many delegations examining in detail various aspects of this complex problem have been on the negotiating table since 1982. It should also be added that a special group of seismological experts studying questions of detecting underground nuclear explosions is also working at the conference.

"The United States, however, refuses talks on drafting a treaty on general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. It alleges that there is a lack of refined methods for registering underground nuclear tests. This in no way corresponds to reality. And this, by the way, was expressed with particular force at the meeting of the International Forum of Scientists for A Nuclear Test Ban held in Moscow the other day. The USSR's major foreign policy initiatives," V.L. Israelyan went on, "have created all the conditions necessary for a very rapid completion of the draft of a convention banning chemical weapons. Proposals taking account of the stances of many states, including the United States, submitted to the conference by our country have made it possible to find a solution to certain complex problems impeding progress. The talks have now entered the stage when all participants are required to show maximum readiness to achieve accords and compromises. Here the matter greatly depends on the stance adopted by the United States and its allies. For some years now it has been impossible to agree on certain kinds of monitoring because of the extremist, discriminatory stance adopted by the United States. The Western states must also show realism and a responsible approach to resolving another still unresolved problem -- the problem of ensuring that chemical weapons are not produced in commercial industry. In short, it is essential to find solutions to many questions still but, given goodwill, they can be found in a relatively short time. A convention banning chemical weapons could be made a reality and one of the most barbaric kinds of weapons of mass destruction is eliminated. Efforts in this direction are being hampered by U.S. and NATO plans to start producing binary chemical weapons and deploy them on the territory of Western Europe.

"Today's political realities," the head of the Soviet delegation stressed in conclusion, "urgently demand that all states do their utmost to help limit the arms race and secure disarmament. As for the Soviet Union, it regards its participation in the Conference on Disarmament with utter seriousness -- a seriousness dictated by its appreciation of the fact that disarmament serves as the main route toward establishing just new international procedures."

/12858

CSO: 5200/1494

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

BRAZIL: LACK OF CREDIBILITY IN GORBACHEV'S PROPOSALS SEEN

Sao Paulo O ESTADO DE SAO PAULO in Portuguese 14 Jun 86 p 3

[Editorial: "Credibility, Gorbachev's Problem"]

[Text] The Kremlin leadership is apparently going through a period of delusion and obsession. Not a single day goes by without Gorbachev or his foreign affairs minister presenting the West with a new proposal for concluding a disarmament treaty. The interesting thing is that the latest proposal is almost always identical to the preceding one, just as the latter proposal was to the one that preceded it, in offering to either freeze the present nuclear arsenal or, as proposed day before yesterday, to reduce NATO and Warsaw Pact conventional forces by 1 million soldiers. The graphs of the balance of forces in Europe, published in our 12 June edition, show eloquently and irrefutably that the ratio of Soviet superiority to the Atlantic Alliance's war potential, in every aspect of conventional and nuclear weaponry, is 3:1 or 2:1. Thus a reduction of forces or a freeze on missiles (in their present state) would increase the USSR's military advantage over NATO forces, particularly since these "generous" Kremlin proposals are contingent on Reagan's abandoning plans to construct a nuclear shield for the purpose of strengthening U.S. defensive and deterrent capabilities in relation to the growing firepower of Russian offensive weapons. Moscow's truly delusive obsession is explained by the Kremlin leadership's panic over the possibility that Washington--since the U.S. Congress and European allies have concurred with Reagan's plans, dictated by good sense and the vital interests of the Atlantic Alliance's own defense--could succeed in equalizing the balance of power without achieving superiority, being satisfied with adequacy.

Our comparison at the outset of this editorial was intended to show why Reagan receives with distrust the countless, almost daily peace proposals, which are so transparently suspect, from the "liberal" and "pragmatic" Gorbachev. The Kremlin is unaware, or better stated, pretends to be unaware that such proposals will not be viewed as credible as long as it insists on fueling regional conflicts (Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Angola, Ethiopia and Cambodia), intensifying and increasing its expansionist adventures in the Third World by relying on its military superiority, whose political and psychological effects favor its imperialist and neocolonialist aims. We recently made an exhaustive analysis of the frustration of the Contadora

Group's efforts, ultimately caused by the military superiority of Nicaragua, which has been ultramilitarized by the Soviets (as a base for establishing a totalitarian regime and a means for implementing its policy of exporting revolution).

Something should be said in this connection about the USSR's military adventure in Afghanistan, which, according to Gorbachev, is a "bleeding wound"--bleeding which, by the way, has now been going on for 8 years (as long as the Vietnam war lasted)--that has so far not produced any tangible results. For as Drew Middleton, veteran military expert of the NEW YORK TIMES, points out, the Russians have only managed to dominate Kabul, the capital, and Herat in addition to some isolated airports and roads. A year ago, the military situation was gradually turning in favor of the heroic resistance fighters, the legendary mujahidin, who dominate more than two-thirds of the country and are today receiving foreign aid, although in insufficient amounts. So much the worse for the Russians.

It would therefore appear that Gorbachev is faced with a difficult choice between continuing the war, thus indefinitely prolonging this "bleeding wound" which is already affecting Soviet soldiers and civilians morally and politically, and intensifying the war effort, aimed at total occupation of the country and liquidation of the resistance, which is gaining the growing sympathy of Muslims outside and even within the Soviet Union. Gorbachev appears to have chosen the second alternative inasmuch as, besides replacing Afghan President Babrak Karmal with Najibullah, chief of Khad (the Afghan KGB [Committee for State Security]), he has sent 30,000 more soldiers to Afghanistan to reinforce the 120,000 already engaged in operations there and whose casualties, coincidentally, already exceed 30,000 (10,000 killed). But in order to win the war--with the incorporation of Afghanistan into the political fabric of the USSR itself--the Kremlin, as Middleton also notes, will have to deploy another 250,000 soldiers, finally concentrating a half-million troops in the invaded country, which is what happened with the United States in the case of Vietnam. Gorbachev seems determined to gamble everything, not only to win the war but also to heal the "bleeding wound." He has therefore assigned Vladimir Ilich Petrov, a high KGB official and oriental affairs expert who formerly served in Kabul and Tehran (from which he was expelled) and who is his proconsul in the Afghan capital, to provide direct assistance to the new leader, Najibullah. This is no way for Gorbachev to obtain the credibility and confidence that his disarmament proposals need in order to be taken seriously. But didn't the allies reject the peace overtures that Hitler, after conquering Poland, in alliance with Stalin, made to the West?

11915/8918
CSO: 5200/2015

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

FINNISH FOREIGN POLICY INSTITUTE CHIEF ON NORDIC NFZ

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 13 Jul 86 p 22

[Article by Kari Mottola: "Disdained and Cherished Venture"; first paragraph is HELSINGIN SANOMAT introduction]

[Text] For a long time the Nordic nuclear-free zone was only a disputed and commended initiative. Now the zone countries have their own report on the venture — and joint deliberations can begin. For the first time the Nordic countries are talking a common language with reference to the Nordic nuclear-free zone. This week Finland joined the ranks of Denmark, Norway and Sweden by publishing an official statement of its position on the zone venture. All the Nordic countries are prepared to continue discussion of the zone despite differing views as to under which conditions they can achieve the jointly approved goal. In a few years time such a radical political change has occurred in the other Nordic countries that Finland again has the ball. In its report the Finnish Foreign Ministry does not anticipate actual negotiations or agreements on the Nordic nuclear-free zone during the next few years. It is aiming at an official joint Nordic study and a continuation of public discussion. Is swifter and more visible progress possible? Is the zone venture a prisoner of superpower relations? Kari Mottola, the director of the Foreign Policy Institute, discusses these questions.

This week the first official statement of Finland's position on the establishment of a Nordic nuclear-free zone was published. It certainly comes as a surprise to many Finns — after all, nearly a quarter of a century has passed since President Urho Kekkonen's proposal. The fact that Finland's Foreign Ministry has prepared a report on the zone intended for public discussion, the last of the Nordic countries to do so, may seem to be even more peculiar. Finland does, after all, wear the mantle of initiative taker in the matter and the whole venture has every so often been identified with Finland. Finland has indeed conspicuously kept the idea of a zone under consideration in its own foreign policy the whole time. Finland has not, however, made an effort to promote the plan for international discussion of mutual negotiations among the Nordic countries.

At first the whole idea was indeed rejected in the Nordic NATO countries of Denmark and Norway. Even after increasing sympathy for it, overemphasis would

be contrary to effective application by the Nordic countries and might only aggravate international relations in Northern Europe.

Toward Common Discussion in a Common Language

The report of the committee headed by Undersecretary of State Klaus Tornudd is an all the clearer sign from Finland: We are ready for a new phase in the zone venture.

The Tornudd Report also takes as diplomatically precise and politically considered a stand on the zone issues as the Dyvig Report (1984) and the Colding Report (1985), named after Tornudd's Danish and Norwegian colleagues, and the 1984 Swedish Foreign Ministry pamphlet on the zone.

Until the publication of the zone reports, the Nordic nuclear-free zone was merely an initiative, an idea that was analyzed in ministries and government offices and commented on in national speeches.

Now we are switching from political shadow boxing to many mutual efforts. It is considered certain that the Nordic foreign ministers will establish a joint Nordic commission at their conference next month. It will be incumbent on it to determine where we are going, on what we agree and on what we differ.

The zone reports provide a common language for common discussion. The analyses and positions contained in the reports — and the financial studies behind them — for the first time provide us with the elements to put together the jigsaw puzzle of the zone and even go on to the business of negotiations as the need arises.

In the present phase a political development surrounding the idea of a zone is also essential — the zone reports are in fact a result of this.

A profound change has occurred in the political climate and public opinion in the other Nordic countries in a short time — during the 1980's — one that has also led to action in the matter of the zone at different levels.

Broad public opinion backs the goal of a Nordic nuclear-free zone. A significant portion of this public — especially active civic organizations — is demanding swift, concrete results. As for this, it is reflected in our political and parliamentary life.

The victorious advance of the idea of a zone in Scandinavia has not been the result of Finland's efforts. It has been a reaction to nuclear armament, an attempt to ease the situation amidst Euroweapons and Star Wars, at least in Northern Europe. This need will only grow in the future if the military alliances keep the pressure up in the arms race and the neutral countries too feel the growing pressures.

In Denmark the majority of the members of the Folketing have — contrary to the wishes of the government — in one of their resolutions demanded that the country declare itself to be permanently nuclear-free and work for the zone.

As early as 1982, a parliamentary committee drafted a report on the zone. The Dyvig Committee, which charted their entire security policy, was appointed at the demand of the Folketing. The government's readiness to comply resulted in the same course for a joint Nordic commission.

In Norway the Colding Committee was part of the Storting parties' package settlement by means of which they were again able to achieve a near consensus on the Danish model for a security policy that was coming apart at the seams. The change to a Social Democratic government immediately led to a readiness to participate in a joint Nordic report.

The appointments of the Dyvig and Colding Committees were a demonstration of the elimination of one political obstacle to the idea of a zone in these NATO countries. Their parliaments and governments no longer see any obstacles to active analysis of the zone issue or to other preliminary efforts, no more so than they do to contacts with the other Nordic countries, although these countries' official position on the establishment of a zone is unequivocally negative under the present circumstances.

In Sweden and Finland too the parliamentary parties have urged their governments to make progress with the zone issue. The political differences are really slight or nearly nonexistent in these countries in comparison with Denmark and Norway. Action is, however, being considered: The Tornudd Committee was indeed the result of the public pressure which public discussion in the other Nordic countries and the zone reports produced.

A conspicuous display of a zone policy on the entire front was the Nordic parliamentary conference last fall in Copenhagen. There was a similar meeting of civic organizations and investigators a year before that. They are producing sequels, a joint Nordic parliamentary committee, among others.

A joint study will provide a response for these governments for a year or two to the external political pressures. A dialogue between the public and the government will be involved in anticipation of the report. It will also be discussed among the Nordic countries and foreign powers.

Then we will once again be at the end of one phase if -- as is to be expected -- the report is content with charting the situation and the committee is not entrusted with the task of drafting action proposals.

Nor does the Tornudd Report propose any other concrete steps for Finland's zone policy "for the next few years."

At the same time the efforts for a zone or the "process" toward a zone are taking place, no changes are apparent in the situation in the Nordic countries with regard to the establishment of a nuclear-free zone. The national reports on the zone speak of this in clearcut language.

In Finland's opinion, with the establishment of a nuclear-free zone the real nuclear-free status of the Nordic countries will be made permanent through multiple mutual commitments. All the zone countries will refuse to accept

nuclear weapons in their territory, not only in peacetime, but also in times of crisis and war. The superpowers will recognize and guarantee protection of their territory from nuclear weapons and their use.

Sweden is largely of the same opinion, but will more clearly demand of the superpowers services in return, among them reductions in the number of nuclear weapons in adjacent areas, which Finland would not, of course, be averse to either.

Denmark and Norway will not go along with the establishment of a separate nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe. With it they would surrender the opportunity to resort to their allies' nuclear weapons if threatened with attack or if an attack should occur.

While absolute nuclear-free status would not conflict with NATO membership, through it they would seek immunity from the common defense strategy of that military alliance, which includes a preemptive strike with nuclear weapons if the need should arise. An opening in the common front would also be regarded as weakening NATO's ability to intimidate the Soviet Union.

In the opinion of Denmark and Norway, the guarantees provided for a nuclear-free zone would be an uncertain replacement for the security guarantees of their allies, which in the zone might be generally weakened.

According to Denmark and Norway's reports, a zone can only be established as part of a broader European security arrangement which would include reductions in nuclear and other weapons as well and other limitations between East and West. This effort must, on the other hand, be largely left in the hands of the superpowers and military alliances.

In such a situation a Nordic nuclear-free zone would strengthen a more general tendency. The establishment of a separate zone might only interfere with more extensive and decisive arms control efforts.

Finland and Sweden support self-operation. Setting the venture in motion is the common affair of the Nordic countries. The superpowers would be allowed to join them when it is necessary.

Closed and Open Policy Alternatives

The rapid change in the situation has perhaps surprisingly again sent the ball flying onto Finland's side of the fence. The initiative for a joint report by the Nordic countries may be an inadequate response to the challenge a worsening security policy situation is raising in the vicinity of Northern Europe.

It is of critical importance for us to find ways of progressing that are not dependent on superpower relations, but are determined or interpreted by the Nordic countries.

The dynamic party to the zone venture — public opinion and political life — hangs out its flag for joint action and self-operation by the Nordic countries.

A joint report effort would be a security policy dialogue among the Nordic countries at an embryonic level. It would create a practice of multiple mutual consultations.

Finland's opportunities for taking action in terms of zone policy lie in strengthening these tendencies.

If we stipulate results in connection with European or superpower relations as preconditions to entering a zone venture, we will close the doors to further progress and come to a standstill in the report phase.

The uncompromising approach of conservative governments and officials is reflected in the Dyvig and Colding Reports. The broader European connection of a zone venture can also be viewed more flexibly. The ongoing political change in Denmark and Norway may provide the prerequisites for it in the near future.

In the zone venture the Nordic countries can take a step forward along with East and West arms control efforts. This would also be an expression of the Nordic countries' desire to determine in which direction we should go in consolidating European security.

In the Tornudd Report, aside from a zone agreement per se, parallel or joint declarations by the Nordic countries are mentioned as alternatives or a first step in the consolidation of nuclear-free status. They could be a practical goal after a joint report by the Nordic countries. They would guarantee the venture's continuing in a direction in which doors could open to further progress.

11,466

CSO: 5200/2722

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: U.S., SOVIET STANCE CONTRASTED

PM241349 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Jul 86 First Edition p 3

[Yuriy Romantsov article: "Two Approaches to Talks; Soviet Peace Initiatives and Washington's Unconstructive Position"]

[Text] "We urge the leaders of all nuclear powers and particularly the USSR and the United States to reach agreement on banning all nuclear tests." How weighty are these lines from the declaration of the participants in the recent Moscow International Forum of Scientists For a Nuclear Test Ban! This impassioned plea was made by competent people who are able to realize better than others the catastrophic consequences of the military use of nuclear energy. As was stressed at M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with representatives of the forum, human civilization will not survive a nuclear war. At best it can expect degradation, but the most realistic scenario is annihilation.

Can this be avoided? Yes, it can. To succeed we must learn to live together, however different our convictions and political systems.

The bilateral and multilateral talks being conducted in Geneva, Vienna, and Stockholm determine to a considerable extent the nature of and prospects for interstate relations, including Soviet-U.S. relations. It is upon the state of U.S. relations, more than any other, that the political climate on our planet depends. That is why it is logical to expect the participants in the dialogue to show supreme responsibility and the utmost constructiveness in seeking points of contact for elaborating solutions.

This is precisely the Soviet Union's approach. Our position at talks on any question -- be it armed forces reductions in central Europe, Confidence-and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, or nuclear and space arms -- rests on peace-loving Leninist policy and is embodied in a series of far-reaching initiatives and proposals put forward by the Soviet Union. That is also the position of the entire socialist community, which was graphically shown in the documents of the recent Budapest conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee -- documents that essentially present a general plan for saving mankind from the most deadly means of warfare.

The Soviet initiatives have triggered a widespread response among the international public -- to the dissatisfaction of certain people overseas. They would like to restrict access to information about the sides' positions to the framework of the talks themselves. There are questions that cannot be publicized -- for instance, those concerning details of progress and accords, or the exchange of proposals and counter-proposals. Here too the Soviet side has been behaving strictly in line with accepted procedures. But there are no secrets about the main thrust of our foreign policy. That is not to the linking of those calling for the creation of cloaks of artificial secrecy.

The fifth round of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms has ended in Geneva. Unfortunately, there were no changes in the U.S. delegation's position likely to promote the attainment of mutually acceptable accords. The U.S. side has essentially still failed to submit any positive proposals. Moreover, it is avoiding, in every possible way, a businesslike examination of the Soviet initiatives. Whereas our country's representatives have taken serious new steps aimed at achieving speedy progress. In particular, they proposed an interim scenario for strategic offensive arms reductions. This envisages slightly less than the previously proposed 50-percent formula, but at the same time includes deep reductions in the sides' nuclear arsenals. Soviet and U.S. offensive arms would also be limited to equal levels. These reductions and restrictions could be implemented if agreement were reached on not overstepping the framework of the ABM Treaty for at least 15 years.

If the U.S. side showed similar goodwill, disarmament matters could begin to progress.

Washington recently announced at the highest level what the Pentagon and the headquarters of the major monopolies linked with the military-industrial complex had long dreamed of -- the abandonment of observance in the future of the agreements concluded between the USSR and the United States in the strategic offensive arms sphere. The fact is that the SALT I and II treaties, which are based on the principle of equality and identical security, do not suit the most belligerent U.S. forces.

According to the Washington center for Budget and Military Priorities [title as published] the abandonment of the limits set by SALT II would allow the Pentagon to considerably expand its programs for building up strategic arms and to deploy by 1996 an extra 320 MX first-strike ICBM's, 336 B-1 strategic bombers, and 4 Ohio-class SSBN's, to commence production over and above the planned level of 144 missiles for Trident-2 submarines, and to halt dismantling submarines equipped with Poseidon missiles.

There are increasing calls in the United States for the open-ended ABM Treaty to be broken [vzлом] -- which would essentially undermine world strategic stability and increase the danger of a nuclear war.

A legitimate question arises: What aims really guide the United States at the talks? Does it want new agreements with the Soviet Union or does it intend to exploit the dialogue as a cover for the arms race?

At present it seems that the United States is more suited not by seeking but by appearing to seek new approaches.

Yes, peace-loving declarations need to be reinforced by specific constructive steps at the talks. As M.S. Gorbachev stated at the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum, "It should be clear that if the U.S. side ignores our initiatives this time too, it will be obvious that the present U.S. Administration is playing an unworthy game on a serious issue on which mankind's future depends." But if Washington heeds the numerous calls from the international public and sensible voices in the United States itself, there will be hope for a more secure future. And the talks will not fail to produce specific positive results.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1501

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET DEPUTY FOREIGN MINISTER VIEWS U.S., EUROPEAN POLICIES

AU241014 Vienna KURIER in German 24 July 86 p 7

[Interview given by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin to DURIER reporter Heinz Nussbaumer; date and place not specified]

[Text] [KURIER] The path toward the text summit between Reagan and Gorbachev is terribly difficult -- Why is this so?

[Adamishin] Well, the Soviet Union wants the meeting. It does not demand any pre-conditions, either. But we say: The opportunity of a summit meeting is too good for just a handshake, for just a photo, for just some cosmetic effect. If there are no results, then there is no point in holding a summit.

[Adamishin] The central question really is armament. And some sort of agreement would be easy to achieve. For instance, a nuclear test ban. He who refrains from nuclear tests is willing to let his nuclear weapons grow obsolete. We are willing to do this. And we agree to any form of verification demanded by the United States. Thus, this can be agreed on without lengthy negotiations. In the case of intermediate-range missiles the situation is similar.

[KURIER] This is as it was last year in Geneva: Moscow is talking about disarmament, Washington about Afghanistan and human rights ...

[Adamishin] Well, there is certainly no doubt that nuclear armament is the central question. The earth is too small for the current stockpiles. But we promised to demonstrate our goodwill also concerning all those topics which America is interested in -- also Afghanistan, and human rights. It is a similar situation as between man and wife: If we want to live together we have to discuss our controversial issues. In America this is not realized so clearly: They demand concessions -- and offer idle talk.

[KURIER] Do you have any explanation for that?

[Adamishin] Those who are now ruling the United States do not want agreements but pressure and militarization. They want to continue the arms race -- just look who is ordering the music in Washington these days: certain companies, certain people. They conjure up the "specter USSR" every time more money is needed for the military budget. This is an old trick. We know that there are also responsible people in Washington, but the "Rambo" fans have the say. However: The whole world sees that there are many Americans who are unhappy with this policy.

[KURIER] And in Moscow everyone is of the same opinion?

[Adamishin] Nobody believes that. In the Kremlin, too, there are many open discussions. But: to come to an agreement with the West -- that is what everyone wants.

[KURIER] Since Gromyko left, Soviet foreign policy has seemed to concentrate less on America alone...

[Adamishin] From the technical point of view you are right: We do not want to see the world with American eyes any longer. [sentence as published]. This is a new approach. But it has nothing to do with Gromyko.

[KURIER] Has Europe become more important for you?

[Adamishin] Yes, we have discovered Western Europe as an independent power -- and we are facing it more actively, dynamically, and openly. More contacts, more talks, more ideas. But very often we encounter a Western Europe that says: "Better talk with America." Obviously you are still too much ashamed of your own interests.

[KURIER] What is the significance of the neutral countries in this new policy?

[Adamishin] Particularly because we consider them very important I regret that the role of the neutral countries seems to be dwindling just now, that your influence on the United States has diminished. At a meeting in Bern recently to prepare for the security conference, all Europeans, including the USSR, agreed to a document of the neutral countries -- only America was against it. Something like that would not have happened to the neutral countries in former times.

[KURIER] Might one of the reasons for this weakness be the disappearance of politicians such as Kreisky and Palme?

[Adamishin] I think you are right. Perhaps, in general, there is less political leadership of this quality in today's Western Europe -- but this is only a personal assumption.

[KURIER] Let us talk about Gorbachev -- what is his role in foreign policy?

[Adamishin] He has an extraordinary role. But not only he himself, but a group of people who understand each other.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1501

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW ON U.S. DEBATES OVER SALT, TEST BAN

LD281935 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 27 Jul 86

["Top Priority" program presented by Vladimir Posner with Drs Sergey Plekhanov and Radomir Bogdanov of the United States of America and Canada Institute in Moscow -- recorded]

[Excerpts] [Posner] Not long ago, on 22 June, a month ago now, I was in Leningrad to host my end of a space bridge with Phil Donahue. It was called Citizens Summit II and it involved 200 women in Leningrad and 200 women in Boston. And during the exchange at one point we got to the issue of SALT II and the fact that the U.S. Administration wanted to break out of it and we also spoke about the nuclear test ban and the Soviet moratorium, unilateral moratorium, and I asked my audience if they would kindly raise their hands if they were against all testing, all production of nuclear weapons and for disarmament and my entire audience voted yes, that they were against that and they didn't want testing and they did want disarmament. And they then asked me to ask Phil Donahue to do the same thing with his audience and he did it. And the entire Boston audience was in total solidarity with the Leningrad audience.

Now to me the Leningrad audience reflected the mood, the desire of the Soviet nation; and I do not know whether the Boston audience has unanimously reflected the mood of the American nation but I think it's fair to say that it certainly reflected the majority opinion, that most Americans would like to see a test ban, most Americans would like to see a stop in the arms race and would like to see disarmament. The reason I bring this up is because of a series of articles that have appeared recently in different American newspapers, in particular THE NEW YORK TIMES which reflect what they seem to call the differences of opinions in the U.S. Administration on this issue: that, for instance, we have Mr Weinberger who takes pride, at least he says that, in not even looking at Soviet proposals, repudiating them without even reading them, and other people seem to be somewhat more compromising and who would like, perhaps, to get some kind of agreement with the Soviet Union. And all of this is seen, at least by some in the United States, as a reflection of American democracy, that is that there are different opinions and that there is discussion and debate. Now I would like to have this discussion with you on this issue of if it's indeed democratic and what is democracy in this case and what about majority opinion? Dr Bogdanov would you care to begin?

[Bogdanov] Let me tell you one thing. I would like to remind to our American listeners the famous Secretary of State Kissinger memoirs and some very interesting, you know, instances of American democracy in that sense how it was used, deliberately used by American politicians. You know they were always creating an impression that there are bad guys and good guys in the American democracy.

Bad guys they, just like Secretary Weinberger, they won't even look at the Soviet proposals and there are good guys like, for instance, Secretary Shultz or somebody else, they are for trying to find a compromise, you know. And for instance, while in Moscow Kissinger was always telling our people please hurry up with the conclusion of this treaty or agreement until Sonnenfeldt comes from Helsinki because he's a bad guy, you know, if he comes he will spoil everything. Let's hurry up. And I should tell that for some time our people were hooked on that and they really hurry up until Sonnenfeldt comes to Moscow.

Then they came to realize it was just a trick, you know, just a kind of a pressure, very sophisticated pressure on us just to get more concessions from us, just trying to frighten us by Sonnenfeldt. And I'm sorry, but I came to know that only many, many years after that one of the participants in that play told me that story, you know. So, Vladimir, I'm sorry I don't know how you or my friend Sergey, I don't believe in that fairy (?tale any longer), it's a fairy tale for me: Good guys, bad guys in the American administration. But at the same time, of course, I recognize that they may have different opinions.

[Posner] You seem to have touched on an interesting idea and I'd like to explore this with you, Dr Plekhanov. Do you think that the differences that are being aired, that I would almost say are being publicized in the United States, the differences on the issue of a test ban, of an agreement in the area of SALT II, the differences which supposedly exist between Mr Weinberger on one hand and his kind of people and, let us say, Mr Shultz on the other hand. Do you think that these are real differences? Or would you say that this is also a bit of a play? What is your feeling as an expert on that American scene?

[Plekhanov] I think it's both. I think there's a lot of play in it and they really make political capital of it but I think that the differences are real. The question is whether they are significant. Because, you know, people can fight over bureaucratic terms, having almost the same views, but just can't really agree about sharing the -- their authority in the matters of national security. Or sometimes if a policy is wrongheaded there are and will be differences over miniscule detail, strong fights because there is that feeling that, you know, we are going in the wrong direction. So therefore there's both the element of playing and the element of reality in it. But I would like to continue on another theme: Nuclear weapons and democracy. I think the existence of governments who, by pushing a button can put an end to the whole planet as a living thing, is a challenge to any kind of democracy.

[Boddanov] Maybe it's a denial of democracy.

[Plekhanov] It's an ultimate denial of democracy. [passage omitted]

[Posner] If you look at this diverse opinion existing in the U.S. Administration today, which in my opinion is being played up, it's very, very visible, it's there for all to see. Do you think there's a possibility that it could be used for two purposes? One purpose would be for its own people. That is to say show the people that there is debate going on and that therefore their aspiration, their desire for a test ban, for disarmament is not hopeless...

[Plekhanov] It's being taken care of.

[Posner] Because there is debate.

[Plekhanov] Yeah, there is.

[Posner] That's on the one hand. On the other hand it might, like, be a signal for the Soviet Union to say also: Oh well, they're debating it so perhaps we should hold off for another period because there is hope that they will come to a positive decision. Do you think that kind of situation could be used?

[Bogdanov] That's really excellent assessment of the situation you have given to us Vladimir, and I wouldn't like to flatter you. I really believe in it. You know American, we call sometimes American political system an establishment and that's exactly what the establishment is doing. What is the American establishment? It's a different branches of power. One of them is mass media. Mass media is taking very active part in all these games, in all these plays, you know. They are interconnected you know. I don't insist that all that is done deliberately, there is a grand conspiracy or something like that. No, I don't say that. I say that's what, how the establishment works. It works in different directions, to give food for its own people, to give something you know to the outside world and to get satisfied themselves; How great democrats they are, how discussions are great within this great American establishment. But if you come down to the essence of the problem you will see that discussions are discussions but the policy is the policy. It's a very different thing. When the administration says that no stopping of testing is in the interest of American national security whatever Congress says, whatever petitions, whatever demonstrations resolutions you have, that the policy which is the real one.

[Posner] Right, yes. Please, Dr Plekhanov.

[Plekhanov] I would like to get back to this question of democracy and nuclear weapons. I recently read a story in the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE about a project underway in Arizona to build a huge bunker which would allow people to survive nuclear war and to live in total isolation from the outside world for years, maybe decades. [passage omitted] The idea is to prepare the best, the cream of the crop in America for the eventuality of a nuclear war. [passage omitted]

[Posner] I wanted to get back to another thing here we were talking about. As you remember, a group of -- an international group of scientists was recently in the Soviet Union and among them American scientists who went down to -- close to Semipalatinsk which is where the Soviet nuclear tests are conducted, to install seismographic equipment to monitor on [changed thought] you know, and all of that, we talked about this. But these scientists later met with General Secretary Gorbachev and asked if the United States does not join with the nuclear test ban before 6 August, which is the day when your unilateral moratorium ends, would you please consider prolonging it. And there is talk about, you know, well, keep prolonging it because after all, American will ultimately some day join in this because after all, time will show, and so on and so forth. I have the view that part of this so-called diverse opinion upstairs might quite be -- might be quite insidious in, you know, kind of playing on the Soviets for them to prolong, prolong, and prolong and prolong the test ban while the United States just keeps on progressing in whatever areas it wants to progress. Do you feel worried about that?

[Bogdanov] I do feel worried about that because, you know, Vladimir, within 1 year they have tested already 15, 15 nuclear devices. All of them are new, not only new but improvement of the existing nuclear charges but also many of them are new. Fifteen. From our side none. So I feel a little bit worried about that and I agree with you, you know, sometimes it come to my mind that it might be that people trying to convince

us that we should not resume our testing, that we should stick to that policy, they just do not figure out with whom we have to deal at the other end, with what kind of people, you know. They will be very (?happy) that we don't do that you know. Just they will increasing, increasing, increasing their capabilities, you know, enhancing their nuclear might, you know, and we will be sitting idle.

You know, that worries me and I'm sure that not only me, it might worry you, might worry Sergey and the other Soviet citizens too. So, your question is very, very important, a very substantial one.

[Posner] Well time is running out and us and I'd like to finish or wind up with what we started out from and that is if we're agreed that democracy means majority rule basically, it means reflecting the desires of the majority rule basically, it means reflecting the desires of the majority in the decisions that are taken by the people elected to office by that majority, would you not say that in this issue that we are looking at, of disarmament, of testing, the Soviet government unequivocally reflects the desires of the absolute majority of the Soviet people, whereas judging from the polls that we get from the United States today the Reagan administration is reflecting a minority opinion. Would you agree with that?

[Bogdanov, Plekhanov] Yes

[Plekhanov] I think that's an accurate description and one would like to see a little more democracy in the United States for the sake of the whole humanity.

[Posner] Well, on that note and we, er, it's not really a pessimistic note because I think we all share the view that ultimately the desire of the majority will triumph, we end this edition of 'Top Priority.' We welcome your suggestions and your views, please write us, and we'll be back a week from today at the same time.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1501

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: SUMMIT DEPENDS ON U.S. ARMS CONTROL STANCE

PM261601 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 27, 14 Jul 86 p 1

[Editorial: "For a Meaningful Summit"]

[Text] At the Soviet-American summit in Geneva last autumn it was agreed that there should be another top-level meeting. But time is passing and the question still remains open. This is disquieting to many. And understandably. In our nuclear age a special responsibility devolves upon the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States. After all, nothing more nor less than the survival of mankind is at stake.

The initial dialogue in Geneva gave rise to definite and not unfounded hopes for changes for the better in Soviet-American relations and, consequently, for an improvement in the world climate as a whole. Some people sincerely believe that a new meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and the U.S. President would in itself be a step towards the desired goal. This time of reasoning on the part of the uninitiated in politics is traceable to the Western propaganda media and the lavish, bombastic assurances given by American political leaders of their desire for peace, their readiness for a high-level dialogue. But their actions present a glaring contrast to their rhetoric. The U.S. Administration is sabotaging disarmament talks and releasing the last brakes on the nuclear race -- the SALT-2 treaty and other bilateral agreements. There is a great deal indeed in Washington's behaviour that is incompatible with political morality, that heightens tension in the world and in Soviet-American relations in particular, and makes for growing distrust between the two countries.

The holding of a new Soviet-American summit meeting in these circumstances would only mean allowing the American side to use it as a smokescreen to cover up the arms buildup, the material preparation of war. We do not propose to become Washington's partner in such deception of world opinion. Mikhail Gorbachev made this clear in his speech in Warsaw.

The Soviet Union is for dialogue. But it must be a dialogue in which both sides seek to achieve tangible results. That is how the question was put at the 27th Congress of the CPSU. And it was examined on this plane at the Budapest meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee and at the June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. We are for a dialogue with Washington, it was stressed at the plenum. We are not slamming any doors: A new meeting with the U.S. President is perfectly possible. But it must proceed in an atmosphere that would open the way to real agreements.

Moscow is determined not to disappoint the hopes of the peoples, who are looking to the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States for practical actions to safeguard peace.

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET COMMENTARY ON MITTERRAND VISIT STRESSES EUROPEAN ISSUES

PM261616 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Jul 86 First Edition p 1

[Yuriy Borisov review: "Continuation of Dialogue"]

[Excerpts] How swiftly history moves forward today! There are the same 24 hours in the day, but they have become fuller and more meaningful. Before our very eyes and by our hands the socioeconomic development of the Soviet Union is gathering pace. Fraternal socialist countries have embarked upon this same path of acceleration. International life is variable and ever changing, characterized by different, in many cases opposite trends. Against this complex background, the myths dividing M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Paris and F. Mitterrand's visit to Moscow are a brief period of time. But it has been marked by improvement in Soviet-French relations.

The Soviet Union and France have accumulated considerable experience in mutually profitable cooperation on fundamental issues of international life, European security, and bilateral ties. And although there have been certain shortcomings in relations between our countries in recent years, a frank and benevolent political dialogue was held on cardinal issues of the world situation during the Paris summit meeting in October 1985. This dialogue successfully continued this week in Moscow.

The Soviet and French leaders thoroughly analyzed the contemporary international situation. The general opinion is that it is causing alarm. The arms race continues, although it could be stopped. The Soviet Union has put forward a realistic program for the step-by-step elimination of nuclear weapons by 2000. The moratorium on nuclear tests has been extended. The Warsaw Pact states recently put forward a new, important initiative in Budapest that takes the wishes of Western countries into account, including those of France, on reducing armed forces and conventional arms throughout Europe's vast territory.

All these proposals have met with understanding and interest on the part of the French leader. The exchange of opinions will be continued through diplomatic channels. But even now "the sides have agreed that the accords which hold the arms race in check and prevent it from spreading to other spheres must not be broken," a report on the completion of the Soviet-French talks states.

A considerable degree of mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and France was once again apparent during the Moscow talks on the question -- vitally important to the whole of mankind -- of preventing an arms race in space and closing it to strike weapons. Space must be peaceful, as must nuclear power, which has 150 nuclear reactors in Europe alone. Conditions for their reliable, accident-free use -- this is well understood both by Moscow and Paris -- must be worked out by the joint efforts of all interested states.

A great deal of attention was devoted to European affairs.

This is natural -- Europe is our common home. The Soviet Union and France have done a great deal to strengthen security on the European continent. They acted in the honorable role of pioneers of detente and actively contributed to the preparation and completion of international meetings in Helsinki, Belgrade, and Madrid. With regard to Europe, F. Mitterrand stressed, "our views coincide totally, even if our continent looks different from the Atlantic coast than it does from the peaks of the Urals."

Completing the first stage of Stockholm meeting by adopting a well-considered, realistic document which would open the way to the next stage in European detente now has particular significance for strengthening peace in Europe. The Soviet side's new constructive proposals on such issues as notification of ground and air troop exercises, and of the movement and transfer of these troops contribute to resolving this task.

The USSR and the French Republic have a considerable number of points of contact on the problems under discussion in Stockholm. They are interested in accord and in seeking possibilities to conclude successfully the first stage of the conference.

This result, as M.S. Gorbachev stressed, would doubtless help to establish mutual understanding and cooperation at the forthcoming Vienna meeting of representatives of the European states, the United States, and Canada. Conditions already exist for an agreement to be reached on a common Soviet-French approach to the Vienna forum and to the interaction of our countries' delegations in Vienna.

The all-European process must make progress across a broad front, as on a large, well-organized construction site. All of its basic areas -- political, economic, humanitarian, and cultural -- require impetus for their development. For us, the human rights problem is inseparable from social justice, which is organically inherent in socialism, and at the same time it is one of the most important, inalienable components of a comprehensive international security system.

But it would be naive and, what is more, a mistake to forget that the political reality in France is far from monotone. There are influential circles which advocate "Atlantic" and "European" solidarity. They urge emulation of Washington and demand stronger French-West German military contacts and the return of French Armed Forces to the NATO military organization. Hypocritical cries are heard saying France's nonparticipation in the American "star wars" plans will supposedly lead to the repression and technological lagging of its economy. I would like to remind these pseudo-patriots of the words of the perspicacious Talleyrand: "The day America comes to Europe, peace and security will be banished from it for a long time."

...Nine months ago the results of the Soviet-French summit meeting in Paris aroused a broad and favorable international response. Now the echo of Moscow is being heard. The political dialogue between the Soviet Union and France is successfully continuing. It once again reminds all people of good will that on the eve of the 21st century only the path of equal talks taking the interests of general security into account leads to peace.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1501

RELATED ISSUES

WORLD SCIENTISTS FEDERATION MEETS IN MOSCOW

Report on Meeting

LD242108 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 24 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS -- The World Federation of Scientific Workers is today among the front ranks of the public working for peace and disarmament, said its President Jean-Marie Legay. He opened here the meeting of the 14th General Assembly of the federation devoted to the 40th anniversary of that international organization incorporating nearly half a million scientists.

In its activity the federation proceeds from the realization of the grown responsibility of scientists for the destiny of civilisation, he said.

The participants in the meeting are to sum up the results of the federations's activity over the past three years, outline the main trends in its work for the nearest future. They are to elect a new executive committee of the federation, examine amendments to its rules and other organizational issues.

Appeal for Disarmament

PM241538 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jul 86 First Edition p 4

["Appeal by the Participants in the International Scientists' 'Science, Technology, and Peace' Forum to the Heads of States and Governments" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Moscow 22 Jul -- We, the participants in the international forum of scientists "Science, Technology, and Peace" from 54 countries express our profound concern at the existing state of tension in international relations and the continuing acceleration of the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and the danger of its being transferred to outer space.

The World Federation of Scientific Workers, other organizations, and movements of scientists and specialists in various fields of science and technology are speaking out in favor of urgent, specific measures to curb the arms race: for the complete and universal liquidation of nuclear, chemical, and other types of mass destruction weapons; for preventing an arms race in outer space and against the militarization of science.

It is now particularly important for the leaders of all states, first and foremost the nuclear ones, to show political will, a constructive approach, and persistence with the aim of disrupting the dangerous course of events and stopping the crazy slide toward a nuclear catastrophe.

We are firmly convinced, that the ending and complete banning of nuclear tests is an important step on the road toward nuclear disarmament. We evaluate highly the USSR's unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests and we call on the U.S. Administration to join it immediately, and to start talks on the complete banning of nuclear explosions. At the same time, we appeal to the leaders of all states possessing nuclear arms not to carry out nuclear tests, and to contribute to the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on their total banning under the strictest and widest control, the effectiveness of which can be completely guaranteed by modern technical means and on the spot inspections.

Such an act of good will and state wisdom would contribute to the growth of confidence, the development of international cooperation, the humanistic use of the achievements of science and technology, and in the long term, the implementation of the dreams of mankind for a world without war and weapons. We call upon the heads of states and governments, Perez De Guellar, the UN secretary general, to undertake energetic steps to solve this task of all mankind.

At the same time, we support the idea of uniting the efforts and the scientific and technical potential of all countries for the peaceful use of space and the solution to the global problems of mankind.

We are profoundly convinced that the achievements of science and technology must serve the well being of people, peace, and progress, and not the creation of ever more new means of death and destruction.

Gromyko Receives Scientists

PM241608 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jul 86 First Edition pp 1, 4

[TASS report: "Scientists' Appeal Handed to USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman"]

[Text] At the request of participants in the international scientists forum, "Science, Technology and Peace," Andrey Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received 22 July in the Kremlin a large group of foreign and Soviet scientists.

The group comprised: Jean-Marie Legay (France), president of the World Federation of Scientific Workers (WFSW); Narendra Gupta (India), WFSW vice president; Kiril Bratanov (Bulgaria); Tokutaro Hirone (Japan); Abdul Razzak Kaddoura, deputy director general of UNESCO; Maurice Wilkins (Great Britain), Nobel Prize Laureate; scientists from the GDR, Finland, United States, New Zealand, Australia, Canada, Morocco, Portugal, the DPRK, and the FRG. Academicians Georgiy Arbatov, Nikolay Basov, Nikolay Blokhin, Vitaliy Goldanskiy, Yevgeniy Primakov, Georgiy Skryabin and other famous Soviet scientists were also present.

On behalf of the participants in the international forum, Jean-Marie Legay handed over the appeal addressed to heads of state and governments. He stressed that this appeal is being sent to the heads of states and governments that have nuclear arms. Front-ranking scientists throughout the world are very concerned over the nuclear arms race, and their representatives, who have gathered in Moscow for the international forum, are demanding the complete elimination of weapons of mass destruction. The Soviet moratorium on the testing of nuclear arms must have consequences and the scientists are calling on the U.S. Administration to join this initiative immediately.

Accepting the appeal of the scientists, Andrey Gromyko stressed that the policy of the Soviet Union is one of peace. There is now no more important and urgent problem for people than the question of which path to follow, which policy to conduct: the one that obliges the world to roll increasingly downhill toward nuclear catastrophe, or the one that would remove the threat of war.

"If anyone should say," he noted, "that there is only one chance in a hundred and maybe in a thousand that a disaster of this kind may take place, then even this is too much. It is necessary to struggle to eliminate this one chance, too. We have no other alternative, and our choice is the policy of peace exclusively."

Certain major Soviet initiatives, set out in the 15 January statement and other speeches by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, concerning a complete destruction of nuclear arms by the end of this century were described.

Andrey Gromyko reported in detail on how Soviet scientists are represented in the USSR Supreme Soviet, in the Soviet Government and in the CPSU Central Committee, on the role assigned to Soviet science in the adoption of political decisions, and on the position of scientists in the USSR.

He dwelled especially on the readiness shown by the Soviet state for the expansion of international scientific cooperation in the sphere of the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and he explained the Soviet position on the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests.

He expressed great appreciation for the activity of the WFSW, which speaks out actively against the arms race. He recalled that in the first postwar years such great scientists as Frederic Joliot-Curie, Robert Oppenheimer and Albert Einstein -- whom he himself had had occasion to meet and whose opinions he had heard on this problem -- pointed out the serious danger of nuclear weapons.

Then he replied to scientists' questions.

Maurice Wilkins (Great Britain): The unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests has led to a situation which a considerable section of the population in the United States, Great Britain and other countries has come to believe in the sincere nature and seriousness of the Soviet Union's policy. Don't you think it would be wise to continue this unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests into the future?

Andrey Gromyko: We would like to have seen the sensible and correct decision made by the Soviet Union also being made by the United States and the other nuclear powers. Our unilateral moratorium expires shortly. What will we do? Our actions will depend on the specific position on questions of disarmament that Washington adopts. Taking this into consideration, we will make specific decisions on this question when the date of the expiry of the moratorium occurs.

Tokutaro Hirone (Japan): The whole world heard with approval the 15 January statement of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, proposing the complete elimination of nuclear arms by the end of this century. But how is this to be done in practice, if states want to approach this question sensibly? The viewpoint of our federation of scientists is to influence the policy of states by all possible means until nuclear arms have been eliminated.

Andrey Gromyko: I particularly liked your last sentence. How is the elimination of nuclear arms to be organized in practice? The Soviet Union has proposals, but to implement them it is necessary to sit at the conference table, having this end in view, and to make calculations, sketch out stages for cutting down, and so forth. But our talks partners do not wish to sit at the same table with us to discuss specifically this problem and resolve it.

Moritz Mebel (GDR): I am a representative of the movement "Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War." In my opinion, ceasing all nuclear tests should be an important step toward eliminating nuclear weapons. If all together we succeed in achieving this cessation now, it will be a very great achievement. I am sure that in this respect our federation can play a very important role.

Andrey Gromyko: I am in total solidarity with you.

Minoru Kitamora (Japan): I think that a political decision to destroy nuclear weapons should be made, and the sooner the better. I would like to say that the measures proposed by the Soviet Union, and its actions, in particular the moratorium on nuclear tests, are highly respected in Japan. At the same time, we must now be getting down to specific steps to reduce and destroy nuclear weapons. I would like to express the view that the Soviet Union will meet the wishes of the Japanese people in this respect.

Andrey Gromyko: We agree that the Japanese people have a sympathetic attitude toward our proposals. But it would be much better if the Japanese Government also adopted such a position. It is very regrettable that so far there is no sign of this.

Paul Hoog (USA): How would you view it if the satellites which are now being launched by individual countries were not the property of those countries but of international organizations? And what if such a satellite system were used for research into the earth's resources and for studying our planet? In addition, they could be used as a warning system of various conflicts and dangers. But the purpose of organizing things in such a way would be to avoid danger.

Andrey Gromyko: You have expressed a very interesting idea. I should like to say that the Soviet Union is open to the discussion of any proposal concerning the peaceful use of space; I stress -- any proposal.

In conclusion Professor Jean-Marie Legay and Academician Nikolay Basov on behalf of all the scientists participating in the meeting, thanked Andrey Gromyko for his account of certain problems of modern times and for his replies to their questions.

TV Commentary

OW250511 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0200 GMT 22 Jul 86

[Aleksandr Serikov commentary; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] An international science, technology, and peace forum has opened in Moscow. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov has sent a message to the participants wishing them new successes in developing international cooperation among scientists to solve the most acute current problems and primarily to establish a lasting peace without wars and weapons on our planet. Our commentary on the work of the forum:

[Serikov] Hello, comrades. This representative meeting of scientists is being held during the days of the 40th anniversary of the World Federation of Scientific Workers, organizers of the forum. The active work of this very large nongovernmental organization of scientists for protecting life on earth is widely known. It was established at a time when humanity rose to struggle for peace and when the planet was shaken by atomic explosions that reduced Hiroshima and Nagasaki to ashes. The federation of scientists actively opposed the chemical war started by the United States in Vietnam.

Scientists have raised their voices against the arms race which is causing great material and moral damage to humanity. Scientists know better than anyone else the force concealed in today's science and how dangerous its separate attainments and technology can be in the hands of irresponsible political leaders.

This is why the scientists united in the World Federation of Scientific Workers have warmly supported the Soviet initiative for stage by stage elimination of all nuclear armaments by the year 2000.

The participation of scientific personnel in social-political life is growing in the world. The initiative of Soviet and U.S. physicians demanding an end to nuclear tests is very valuable. At a recent Moscow international forum, scientists, just like the physicians, said that all nuclear tests must stop if we do not wish to bring fatal consequences upon civilization. Foremost minds, as the scientific workers are called, realize more and more clearly that it is not possible to sit and do nothing in the current explosive situation, and that it is necessary to act. Owing to their multifaceted activities which include articles in newspapers and magazines, public statements, and participation in international movements, people in various countries are learning more about the Soviet peace initiatives and more clearly understand that there are no alternatives to detente, that there are no alternatives to the ban on all potentially catastrophic testing of nuclear weapons, and that a new thinking -- a new approach -- to the problem of preserving life on earth is needed.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1501

RELATED ISSUES

WORLD SCIENTISTS FORUM IN MOSCOW DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES

PM231426 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Jul 86 Second Edition p 3

[V. Baberdin, M. Rebrov report: "For the Sake of Progress: Notes From an International Forum of Scientists"]

[Text] During these days a forum of the planet's scientists on the subject of "Science, Technology, and Peace" has been taking place in Moscow within the framework of the International Peace Year proclaimed by the United Nations, together with the 14th General Assembly of the World Federation of Scientific Workers [WFSW], which is marking its 40th anniversary.

The Moscow forum brought together prominent scientists from Europe, Asia, Africa, and America. Physicists, chemists, biologists, oceanologists, geographers, historians, and sociologists, they converged on Moscow to reaffirm that the problem of saving human civilization and mankind itself from annihilation is the central axis of their common interests, irrespective of ideology or the sociopolitical system of the states they represent.

In a message to the forum participants, N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, stressed: "Your symposium and assembly are taking place at a difficult time for the world. How mankind enters the third millennium will depend largely on the resolution of existing global problems, among which questions of war and peace have been placed at the center of international life by the course of history itself...In the interests of the radical improvement of the international situation and mankind's deliverance from the threat of nuclear disaster, the USSR has taken major steps to ensure that the positive line which emerged at the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva is embodied in concrete actions. Our peace initiatives are aimed at the implementation of the comprehensive program of international security, which reflects the vital interests of the world community."

There was warm approval from those present for the words of greeting read out by S.A. Shalayev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the AUCCTU.

"With the characteristic optimism of scientists, we must do everything possible to ensure that the scales of history tip in the right direction, that the peace movement widens and strengthens everywhere, and that every opportunity is used to bring about detente in international relations," Professor J.-M. Legay, president of the WFSW and holder of the international Lenin Prize "For Strengthening Peace Between Peoples," stated. "We must place our professional knowledge at the service of international co-operation."

Today more than ever before, the people of the earth are aware of the international nature of science and of the fact that close scientific links are motive forces for science and technology.

Science is strength. This was said long ago, and not by us. Our eventful 20th century, with its scientific and technical achievements, has repeatedly confirmed the correctness of this formulation. But even today the people of the planet are concerned about this question: "What are the 'hot spots' in science, what discoveries promise to bring mankind the greatest benefit, yet at the same time could be turned against him with annihilating force?"

We know where the century's greatest discovery -- the splitting of the nucleus -- led, and what stockpiles of destructive power have accumulated. These stockpiles, expressed in TNT equivalent, amount to many tons of explosives for every inhabitant of the earth, and in terms of explosive power correspond to a million bombs like the one dropped on Hiroshima.

And what does mankind's entry into outer space mean? The unraveling of the nature of many of the mysteries of the Earth, the planets, and the stars and of meteorological phenomena and their control, and thus new opportunities for farming, the exploitation of the planet's mineral resources, the creation of new types of communications and navigation, and new technological operations in a vacuum and in weightlessness, which offer the opportunity to obtain previously nonexistent metal alloys and ultrapure substances. The keys to many terrestrial problems lie in space, L.N. Feoktistov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, noted in his speech. But at the same time the danger arises of its being used as a bridgehead for unleashing "star wars."

The atom and space are not the only problem worrying people today. Today, just as at the dawn of the nuclear and space age, mankind is on the threshold of discoveries which are of tremendous significance for the resolution of the energy and food problems. But at the same time the danger arises of creating new, still more sophisticated means of waging war, capable of presenting mankind with a danger more catastrophic even than thermonuclear war.

The discussions, in the course of which the complex, important problems of ending the arms race and going over to real disarmament and a universal system of international security are being discussed, are taking place in an atmosphere of sincerity and constructiveness.

Coming out actively against the development, testing, and use of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, as well as all other types of weapons of mass destruction, the WFSW does much to mobilize world public opinion in support of the conclusion of international treaties which considerably restrict or entirely ban the use of such weapons.

Scientists from the United States and France, the FRG and Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and India, Japan and Britain, and other countries spoke of the ever increasing dangerous trend in the capitalist countries -- that of using science and technology for military purposes. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 20 times more resources are spent on scientific research and development work for military purposes than in civil sectors. With the production of weapons based on new principles, this trend is being stepped up still further. This applies to a considerable degree to the sinister "star wars" plans. The arms race is taking on an unprecedented scale here.

The role of science in society is defined by society itself, and science serves society. It is possible to use the methods of genetic engineering to resolve successfully and effectively the problems of food and healthcare, which are very important to the people of the earth, or at the same time to use them to create lethal and toxic weapons. In a word, in the conditions of scientific and technical progress great significance is attached to the question of who enjoys its fruit and in what way.

"Politics and science must now cooperate more than ever before," M.S. Gorbachev stressed in his meeting with representatives of the international forum of scientists for an end to nuclear tests. [paragraph continues]

"In our age there must be no science which does not consider what political consequences its discoveries or achievements could have. And there must be no politics which is not based on the achievements of science, on its strict analysis and objective assessments and predictions."

The moral duty of scientists makes them state honestly and clearly where the world should go -- in the direction of creating ever new types of lethal weapons which increases the danger of a mutually destructive conflict, or along the path of limiting the arms race and moving toward disarmament and the creation of a new system of security, lasting peace, and broad international cooperation for the benefit of man.

The international forum of scientists continues its work today.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1501

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: SOCIALIST STATES URGE AD HOC UN DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

LD091639 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 9 Jul 86

[Text] New York, 9 July (TASS)--TASS correspondent Sergey Baybakov reports:

Socialist countries view a world conference on disarmament as an important step toward pooling the efforts of all nations for the sake of averting the threat of nuclear war and curbing the arms race. At a session of the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, underway here, representatives of Hungary, Vietnam and the USSR emphasized that this forum could become an important instrument in practical disarmament.

The need for the conference is particularly obvious now that the arms race enters a new stage, comprising virtually all areas of the world, said Vietnam's representative Bui Xuan Nhat. Such developments are a consequence of the policy of the aggressive imperialist circles that recklessly bank on achieving global military superiority.

Hungary's representative Istvan Mikus emphasized that the world disarmament conference might play a positive role in the quest of new approaches to the solution of the problem of lowering war danger, particularly nuclear danger. In this connection he pointed to the importance of the program of the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe advanced at a recent meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states.

The nuclear age demands a new approach to international relations, the pooling of the efforts of states with different social systems for the sake of ending the disastrous arms race and for a radical improvement of the world political climate, said Soviet representative Ye. Golovko. The Soviet Union proceeded and will proceed from the awareness of this in planning its foreign policy steps.

The Soviet delegate pointed out that the USSR has of late made important proposals, advanced a concrete plan for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction by the end of the 20th century and of prevention of the spread of the arms race to space. Introducing a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, the Soviet Union urged the United States to follow its example and thus to clear the road to

the conclusion of an agreement on a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests. We are deeply satisfied with a positive reaction with which broad circles of the world public met the Soviet proposals for the consolidation of peace, the Soviet representative said.

The peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries could serve as a good basis for serious talks, the Soviet delegate said. They justify the convocation of a world conference on disarmament since they comprise actually all spheres of arms limitation and disarmament, do not advance any preliminary terms for the beginning of the discussion of proposals contained. The Soviet delegation is confident that if the disarmament conference be convened shortly, this would become an important contribution to the removal of war danger. The United Nations member countries who earlier held a negative stand on the matter should show political readiness for a constructive dialogue so as to determine the schedules and the ways of concrete preparation for the world disarmament conference.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1501

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA WEEKLY REVIEW: TEST BAN VERIFICATION, SALT, UK TRIP

PM231914 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jul 86 First Edition p 4

[Nikolay Kurdyumov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] The Authoritative Voice of Scientists

July is the height of summer and, in the Northern Hemisphere, the traditional time for vacations. Events show, however, that the international calendar makes no provision for vacations. Mankind is now living through a rather complex and critical period of its history.

The international situation remains tense through the fault of aggressive imperialist circles. The monstrous arms race which they have unleashed is continuing, and the world stands at a borderline which could mark the start of unpredictable processes.
[paragraph continues]

Under these conditions, as M.S. Gorbachev remarked this week during meetings and conversations with figures from abroad, the Soviet Union will continue to consistently follow a line aimed at the achievement of a fundamental breakthrough in the development of the international situation, the liberation of mankind from the burden of nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons, and the creation of an all-embracing system of international security.

At periods which are crucial for the world, importance attaches to various initiatives like, for example, the Goodwill Games, which further mutual understanding and confidence and help to reduce and eliminate suspicion and tension in relations between peoples and states. In the nuclear age, the only approach to international problems which can be acceptable and realistic is the approach which recognizes every country's right to decide its own internal affairs, rules out the use of force, and displays patience and tolerance and respect for everyone's legitimate interests.

A reminder about the crucial nature of the present time was issued once again in the authoritative voice of scientists from 32 countries who gathered in Moscow to discuss the most burning problem of the present -- a problem which involves the preservation of human civilization. Having discussed the question of the threat hidden in the nuclear arms race and the improvement of new types of nuclear weapons, the representatives of world science issued a warning in the unanimously adopted declaration -- a warning that sounds like an alarm bell:

"We are faced with a simple and merciless reality: Human civilization will not survive a nuclear war. The most sophisticated technological systems can produce unexpected and

catastrophic breakdowns. The recent tragic events with 'Challenger' and at Chernobyl convincingly emphasized this."

Active measures are needed to reduce the risk of nuclear war, the scientists declared, and the first step along this path could be a verifiable [poddayushcheyesya proverke] and total ban on nuclear tests which, in turn, could act as a brake on the nuclear arms race.

Pointing out in the joint document that the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium offers unique opportunities for a total ban on nuclear tests, the scientists expressed the hope that it will be joined by the United States and the other nuclear powers. As regards the problems of verification [kontrol], the participants in the Moscow forum expressed firm belief that the latest achievements in seismology, coupled with jointly observed international procedures including on-site inspection, offer a high degree of confidence that nuclear tests will no longer take place.

This confidence is based on strictly scientific data. Convincing proof of the possibility of verification [kontrol] is provided by the joint Soviet-U.S. research program which is currently underway in the sphere of the methodology of verification [kontrol] of nuclear tests. Seismic recording stations equipped with highly sensitive instruments are being sited in Kazakhstan and Nevada in accordance with the agreement between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Committee on Natural Resources [Komitet po Zashchite Prirodnikh Resursov]. The program is planned to last 1 year. This equipment has already been installed on USSR territory near the testing ground close to Semipalatinsk, and trial observations have taken place.

U.S. specialist Professor T. Cochrane, one of those directly involved in this work, noted the main objective of cooperation between scientists from the two countries is to prove the inconsistency of the view held in the United States that it is supposedly impossible to detect without error all nuclear tests in the Soviet Union.

Pointing out the exceptional importance of the scientists' initiative, M.S. Gorbachev noted during his meeting with representatives of the international forum that everyone -- be they politicians, scientists, or people -- must act now. And they must act without delay. "We still hear people say: Why such haste, why be in such a hurry, it may be better to stretch this whole struggle against the arms race over a number of years or even even decades? These opinions are wrong. We have reached a stage in the scientific and technical revolution when new discoveries could whip up the arms race still further and could create a situation in which it would be much more difficult to even begin talks."

Our country's constructive proposals and initiatives, which accord with the interests and innermost aspirations of all peoples, are well known. The Soviet Union has twice extended the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, put forward far-reaching proposals for the destruction of chemical weapons, together with the other Warsaw Pact states proposed a vast program for reductions in conventional weapons, and, finally, submitted at the Geneva talks compromise proposals concerning both medium-range missiles and the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union is entitled to expect an adequate [adekvantnaya] response from the U.S. side and the Western countries in general. The response so far, however, cannot be described as satisfactory. And as regards the termination of nuclear tests, the Washington Administration's stance on this issue remains frankly negative. The underground nuclear explosion carried out in Nevada this week -- the 14th test officially announced by Washington since the introduction of the Soviet moratorium -- showed yet again that the United States maintains its course of undermining efforts to curb the nuclear arms race.

So far, no satisfactory response has been forthcoming from the Washington Administration to the Soviet proposals on medium-range missiles and on strategic weapons. Instead, something else is clearly discernible. When reading Washington's statements to the effect that the SALT II treaty is dead or hearing calls to accelerate the implementation of the "star wars" program, one automatically draws the conclusion that the efforts being made on the other side of the ocean are aimed not at the quest for new international machinery to block the arms race, but at the liquidation of the last brakes on that race.

Under these conditions, it is far from accidental that many people in the United States criticize and condemn the course taken by the administration aimed at breaking Soviet-U.S. accords on arms control reached in the past. As the Union of Concerned Scientists declared a few days ago, "by destroying the SALT II treaty, Reagan has shaken the national and international accord [soglasie] on the need to maintain nuclear stability." A new twist to the arms race is inevitable without the treaty's restraining influence.

An article by a group of eminent U.S. specialists in ATLANTIC magazine is worthy of attention. On the basis of years of research, its authors, including former U.S. Secretary of Defense R. McNamara, have drawn the conclusion that the United States must follow the USSR's example and announce its renunciation of the strategy based on the threat of delivering a first nuclear strike because it is fraught with a global thermonuclear conflict and prevents the reaching of agreement on curbing the arms race.

Deep-seated fears in connection with the U.S. course of torpedoing SALT II and other treaties are particularly clearly discernible in Europe and among the U.S. NATO allies. For example, Norway's Foreign Minister Knut Frydenlund noted a few days ago that many West European states, including those ruled by conservative governments, are critical of the Washington Administration's stance at the Geneva and Vienna talks. [paragraph continues]

He spoke in favor of including the U.S. SDI Program in the agenda of the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons. Touching on the Norwegian government's attitude to the basic Soviet-U.S. ABM treaty, the head of the foreign policy department declared that this treaty must be not only supported but also comprehensively developed and strengthened.

Soviet-British Dialogue

A major event took place last week in relations between the USSR and Britain, which carries considerable weight in European and world affairs and without whose cooperation it is difficult to find a radical solution to problems of arms limitation and reduction. E.A. Shevardnadze paid an official visit to that country.

An exchange of opinions on key questions of world politics, and primarily questions concerning security, the easing of international tension, and the reduction of the threat of war took place during the conversations and talks in the British capital. Moreover, both sides noted the importance of reaching agreement on reducing military confrontation on the European Continent, limiting and reducing arms, and consolidating strategic stability. It must be noted that the British side spoke definitely in favor of, for example, the observance of the existing SALT I, SALT II, and Soviet-U.S. ABM treaties, and for progress at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons. It is hardly necessary to adduce proof that at present, when there is an emerging danger that the arms race may spread to outer space, the consolidation of the ABM treaty regime acquires particular significance.

Both sides also agree that the new meeting between the top USSR and U.S. leaders must end with substantial practical results, primarily on security problems. Emphasis was also placed on the importance of a successful conclusion to the Stockholm conference.

The discussion of the package of questions of bilateral relations resulted not only in the discovery of good opportunities for their further development but also in the achievement of substantial practical results. For the first time in the last 10 years, three important agreements were signed on one and the same occasion, including one in the military sphere. They are an intergovernmental agreement for the prevention of incidents at sea beyond the limits of territorial waters, a 5-year program for economic and industrial cooperation, and an agreement on the settlement of reciprocal financial and property claims.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo noted at its session that the London talks, the conversations with leaders of political parties, and the Soviet-British agreements which were signed constitute an important step in the continuation of political dialogue between the two countries and in the development of their mutual relations and cooperation on issues where the sides share points of contact and common interest in reducing international tension and strengthening peace.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1501

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET BOOK ON U.S. 'POLICY OF ERODING TREATIES'

LD291150 Moscow TASS in English 1116 GMT 29 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 29 TASS -- "If the existing treaties and agreements prevent the U.S. Administration from freely building up and modernising its weapons, they in the White House act according to the principle -- the worse it is for these treaties and agreements". This conclusion is drawn by Vladimir Chernyshev, the author of the book "Washington: The Policy of Eroding Treaties and Agreements" which has been issued in English by the APN (NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY) publishers.

The sharp swing of U.S. foreign policy to the right after the Reagan administration came to power, Vladimir Chernyshev wrote, has done heavy damage to the process of limitation and reduction of weapons. Washington began openly expressing its disregard for the agreements concluded earlier and declared its intention to destroy or abandon them.

The book gives a detailed analysis of the violations by the USA of the provisions of the SALT treaties and contains a large volume statistics.

The author holds that when official Washington succeeded in starting work to create strike space weapons, those who are fond of military adventures began to "hope" that under cover of a space shield they would be able to launch their first nuclear strike with impunity. As a result of the SALT-2 treaty "began going to pieces" and together with it the hopes of the peoples for new Soviet-American arms control agreements.

Vladimir Chernyshev clearly shows that the "violations" of treaties and agreements ascribed by the U.S. Administration to the Soviet Union are an absurd invention designed to justify the weapons race launched in the USA under the pretext of a mythical Soviet threat.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1501

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW TALK SHOW: SCC, SALT II, TEST BAN, EUROPEAN, ASIAN ISSUES

LD271934 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 27 Jul 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, publicist; and Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov, Central Television and All-Union Radio political observer]

[Excerpt][Tsvetov] Hello comrades. Quite a few very interesting and important international events took place last week, and, evidently, it is not altogether easy to single out the main one. All the same, I would like to begin with the extraordinary session of the standing Soviet-U.S. Consultative Commission. It began its work on 22 July in Geneva. I will remind radio listeners that the commission was set up in 1972 to solve issues that arise in the course of implementing arms control agreements. Since 1979, when the Soviet Union and the United States signed the Strategic Arms Limitation treaty -- we call it SALT II for short -- the commission has started dealing with issues related to this treaty. The current session is devoted to a definite theme, namely the intention announced by President Reagan to withdraw from SALT II. The negotiations in progress in Geneva are confidential, so we will not conjecture about what is being talked about there but will talk about the approach.

[Bovin] One can imagine what is being talked about: We want to clarify with the Americans, so to speak, get information more accurately and clearly about the motives for their behavior. Well, obviously, there will be some talk on this level, because we do have sufficiently precise arguments, our positions are sound, and we will set forth our interpretation of these things. Clearly, conversations will be conducted around these positions, although, of course, it is difficult to say specifically.

[Tsvetov] Evidently we must first say that, although the United States signed the treaty, it did not ratify it. It has, however, expressed the intention to continue to observe the provisions contained in it. As for the Soviet Union, we consider this treaty alive, notwithstanding the fact that it expired on 31 December of last year. So first, it is probably worth saying something about the purport of the treaty.

[Bovin] Well, the treaty, as a treaty, states the definite levels of strategic potentials, for example. Had it been ratified, the overall quantity of strategic arms delivery vehicles on each side would have been 2,250 -- on our side and on the U.S. side -- but inasmuch as it was not ratified, correspondingly, those ceilings that were fixed in 1979 have remained. We had, let us say, 2,504 delivery vehicles then. We showed them, and we have retained them for the present. Of course, we...

[Tsvetov interrupting] What you have in mind is nuclear weapon delivery vehicles?

[Bovin] Yes, strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles, meaning launch-tubes on submarines, ground-based missiles, and strategic airplanes.

[Shishlin] What I want to say is that, all the same, these Soviet-U.S. meetings that are taking place in Geneva also need, I think, to have their background assessed, strictly speaking, the background against which these discussions are being held and taking place. On the one hand, there is the Soviet position as is known, a very broad position and a bold one. Major proposals have been put forward aimed at actually cutting back all categories of arms, not only strategic ones, but also medium-range and conventional arms.

On the other hand, the U.S. position is known: The United States, over all these months in 1986, has declined to take any steps to meet the Soviet Union. Against this background, when the United States is striving to give its position on the key problem -- the problem of curtailing arms -- perhaps a more attractive appearance. They, strictly speaking, have made the move to hold a meeting with our representatives....

[Bovin interrupting] Because it was our idea....

[Shishlin interrupting] Yes, really, these talks are of a strictly confidential nature. After all, in general the Americans are not hiding the fact that they are not expecting any important shifts either in SALT II discussions or in the U.S.-Soviet meetings on the issue of banning nuclear tests. For example, this, unfortunately, for the time being only fits in the framework of the political cosmetics the White House often resorts to. In any case, we must not stop at describing these meetings as cosmetics. Still, this is a reflection of the very wide and important processes that are developing as a whole in international relations.

[Tsvetov] So, to return to the essence of the U.S. accusations addressed to the Soviet Union: These accusations, in essence, come down to two main points. The first is that the Soviet Union has created [sozdal] a second new type of ICBM. According to the terms of SALT II, each side may create [sozdal] one new type of intercontinental ballistic missile. So, the United States is accusing the Soviet Union of having created [sozdal] not one new type, but two new types. What is being referred to here is the SS-25 missiles. This missile is however, a modification of an old missile. The United States knows this perfectly well and nevertheless makes the accusation. The second accusation is that the Soviet Union is encoding telemetric data on ICBM tests. This also is untrue, because the Soviet Union is not encoding the telemetric information the United States needs to verify how the Soviet Union is observing the terms of SALT II.

At the same time, I must say that the United States itself is indeed violating this treaty. To the one new type of MX ICBM, which is allowed by the terms of the treaty, the United States has added yet another new type, the mobile, small, Midgetman missile. Moreover, it has also begun developing [razrabatyvat] a third new type of ICBM called Mobileman. This is a large missile with a large number of warheads. Second, the United States is hiding work on the creation [sozdaniye] of silos for the ICBM's, which is prohibited by the treaty, because, according to the terms of the treaty, the Soviet Union, with the aid of its national technical means, must be allowed to follow the construction of silos for missiles. Third, the United States has sited Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe. These missiles are strategic ones in relation to the Soviet Union, and siting them is also a violation of SALT II.

The U.S. intention to withdraw from SALT II is accounted for by the following very specific reason: Currently the United States is rearming and modernizing its B-52 strategic bombers. The modernization is going ahead at the rate of one bomber every 3 weeks. This means that in December, the United States will go beyond the limits established by SALT II. So, the withdrawal from the treaty has been thought up so that there would not be any obstacle to the modernization of the B-52 bombers, which are being equipped with cruise missiles. There is another reason that is more profound and evidently more important. If the United States rejects SALT II, in the course of the next 10 years 126 billion dollars will be required to create [sozdaniye] new strategic systems. Of course, the U.S. military corporations cannot let such a fat slice slip by, so these corporations are pressing the U.S. Administration to withdraw from the treaty.

We have already said here that the present session of the Soviet-U.S. Standing Consultative Commission was convened at the Soviet Union's suggestion. That does not signify, however, that we need SALT II more than the United States. This treaty is needed by both countries for a continuation of the process of reducing strategic forces, for the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations as a whole and thereby for detente. Guided by these considerations, the Soviet Union suggested holding the present session.

[Shishlin] This of course, raises another question: To what extent does Soviet policy bear results and how effective are those initiatives being put forward by the Soviet Union.

[Tsvetov interrupting]... such as how large an influence are they exerting?

[Bovin] Here is another meeting. This is also very interesting. After all, the Consultative Commission began on Tuesday, and on Friday the meeting of experts on the issues of underground nuclear tests began.

[Shishlin] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich....

[Bovin] Yes?

[Shishlin] I am sorry for interrupting. One cannot forget that the United States, on the eve of this meeting, carried out their 15th nuclear test.

[Bovin] Yes, yes, this second group of experts is also a very interesting issue. The first conference of Soviet and U.S. experts on nuclear tests took place in 1958. At the time, the technology was not what it is today. They got stuck then on the fact that, with the existing technology, it was impossible to distinguish a nuclear blast from an earthquake of a certain force. The 1963 treaty did not include underground tests. In 1974 we signed a threshold treaty with the Americans that limited the yield of nuclear blasts, but the Americans, as with SALT II, signed the treaty but did not ratify it.

[Shishlin] Although it is being said that they may nevertheless come round to ratification....

[Bovin interrupting] After -- as they are saying -- after the verification mechanisms have been more precisely defined. If they were to sign this treaty, however, a protocol would be appended to it, precisely on the verification procedures. I shall read some of the provisions from this here. What are the sides obliged to do? They are to inform one another of the geographical coordinates of the limits of every

testing ground and of all individual test sites. Further, they are to provide the other side with information on the geology of test sites, the characteristics of the rocks and geological formations and their main physical properties. Then they are to give the geographical coordinates of all these tests and carry out calibrational explosions. All this could be done, but nothing has been done simply because the Americans have refused to ratify it. They are making a fuss about monitoring again. Technology has, of course, now forged ahead in comparison with 1958. That means that, as both our experts and many American experts say, there are no problems regarding the technology. The Americans, however, are not even pretending that monitoring is the issue now; they simply say: We need nuclear tests, we shall carry out....

[Shishin interrupting] Yes, and if they talk about anything, then it is about the possibility of thinking about limiting the number and yield of explosions.

[Bovin] They have another idea, namely, we shall indeed cut the numbers of nuclear weapons, and we shall cut them by, say, 10 percent. We shall also make a 10 percent reduction in the number of nuclear tests. This logic is turned upside down, because what is the purpose of stopping nuclear tests, in general? To slow the arms race. If each country is unable to test new types of weapons, that means it cannot develop [sozdavat] them, but the Americans want to do both.

[Tsvetov] Last week Soviet-West German negotiations at the foreign minister level ended. These were preceded by negotiations between the USSR and British ministers of foreign affairs, and even earlier by summit negotiations between the Soviet Union and France. Analyzing the results of these three sets of negotiations, one can say that the main conclusion made at these meetings could probably be considered to be the following: In order for Europe to remain Europe, it must be peaceful.

[Bovin] That's true. Nevertheless, Europe is more closely attached to disarmament than the United States is; the level of political culture is higher there, if you like. And it is our position that our West European partners should to some degree work on their transatlantic ally to promote greater realism, a more sober attitude, and a greater degree of constructiveness in approaching these complex problems which are a subject of concern both to the West Europeans themselves and to us.

[Shishin] The United States often accuses us, the Soviet Union, of trying to use our activities in the European sphere -- and not only there -- to drive a wedge between the United States and Western Europe. But politics, is after all, the art of the possible and there is a clear awareness in Moscow that the North Atlantic alliance is a pretty stable military-political structure....

[Bovin interrupts]...and that despite all these contradictions there is more that unites them than sets them apart.

[Shishlin] Yes, but at the same time, of course, Moscow takes account of the fact that Britain, just like France, Italy, and West Germany, has its own national interests in addition to common interests linking it with the United States.

[Bovin] and European interests, too.

[Shishlin] And pan-European interests. Within the framework of these pan-European interests, we can of course talk quite fully and constructively with both London and Paris, with Bonn and Rome, and with the other capitals of European states. There is no doubt that the negotiations which took place with President Mitterrand, with British Prime

Minister Thatcher and Foreign Secretary Howe, and with Genscher leave one convinced that these results are of course solid and serious ones.

[Bovin] These talks are useful of course, and they are necessary from various point of view. But we ourselves must take account of the fact that there is a quite clear divergence of positions between us, for instance, and the three countries mentioned, at least. Let's take, for instance, the problems of disarmament. Our idea is this: to remove all medium-range missiles from Europe.

We will destroy our missiles if the Americans do the same with theirs. But we say this under two conditions: First, if the British and French do not increase their potentials; and second, if the Americans do not sell Europe more up-to-date weapons, as they want to in the case of Britain. But both Britain and France are in fact blocking progress on this aspect of disarmament.

[Shishlin] But there is, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich also the practical sphere of relations.

[Bovin] Yes, of course, bilateral relations.

[Shishlin] This is a lofty sphere of policy. There are purely economic interests as well, interests relating to the spiritual needs of the European peoples in relations.

[Bovin] Of course.

[Shishlin] And it is precisely in these directions that the results of the talks which were held before our very eyes seem to me to be extremely significant; as concerns our mutual relations with West Germany, and with France and Britain as well.

[Tsvetov] It seems to me that one should draw attention to another particular feature, too: The differing approaches of the United States and the Soviet Union to Western Europe. To characterize, the United States' approach can be expressed in the words, for example, of General Pershing, who said as far back as World War I that America's front line passes through Europe. You see, this is an attitude which quite definitely looks down upon its NATO partners.

[Bovin] Well, Pershing was around a long time ago, but just 10 years ago Kissinger formulated the position that the United States has global political interests, while Western Europe's interests are regional ones. And this is the difference between the American and European approaches. All in all, this puts Western Europe into a subordinate position -- which the Europeans do not like very much, incidentally.

[Tsvetov] On the other hand, there is the attitude of the Soviet Union: the proposal to see one another as sovereign and equal partners in drawing up pan-European policy, and to respect one another's legitimate interests. And of course, it seems to me that these negotiations -- Soviet-French, Soviet-British, Soviet-West German -- have to a certain degree raised the prestige of Western Europe at the present time, and attributed even great importance to the role of Western Europe in international affairs.

[Bovin] Well, there is another aspect here. Of course, Britain, France, and West Germany are the first violins in the West European orchestra and we are dealing with them. But we are now stepping up our policy in regard to the small and medium-sized countries of Europe. Experience has shown that it is sometimes easier for small and

neutral countries to feel out some kind of ground for compromise, especially during a period when mutual relations between us and the Americans, for instance, between East and West, are somewhat strained; and they can play a positive role here. We see this and value it.

[Tsvetov] This is often shown in practical matters. When, for example, the negotiations became deadlocked in Stockholm, it was precisely the nonaligned and neutral countries which...

[Bovin interrupts] The N and N group...

[Tsvetov] ...the N and N group, which found compromise solutions so that the two opposing sides could nevertheless bring their positions a little closer.

[Shishlin] In this connection I would like to remind the comrades listening to us what positive moves are planned in mutual relations between the CEMA and the EEC. These need not be reduced, in the case in point, merely to economic relations, to trade relations. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are ready to regard the Common Market countries as a sort of political unit as well, to the degree that the EEC acts as a political unit. So, all in all, we are now discovering that the world in which we live is nevertheless, as was to be expected, not an immobile one. It is a dynamic world in which processes which are by no means negative are evolving.

But some processes are becoming outlined which without doubt express this same internal need for a revival of the process of relaxation of tension, the emergence of a new detente, a new phase of detente, a new stage in detente. We cannot say when this will happen. But there is no doubt that things are moving in this direction.

[Tsvetov] I would like to draw attention to another region in the world, in which very interesting political and economic manifestations are taking place -- the Asiatic-Pacific Ocean region.

[Bovin] Well, interesting changes are taking place in Japan just at the moment.

[Tsvetov] You know, when I looked through the list of the new Japanese Cabinet, two interesting appointments attracted my attention: the minister of foreign affairs and the head of the National Defense Agency. Tadashi Kuranari has become minister of foreign affairs, and he is totally unknown to most of our listeners. I should point out that he has no wealth of diplomatic experience.

[Bovin] On the other hand, he is a friend of Nakasone, apparently.

[Tsvetov] Yes, he is not only a friend of Nakasone, he is his most loyal follower, so to speak. In my view, this appointment shows that Nakasone wants to deal with foreign policy issues himself. And here's another interesting thing. At his first press conference, the new minister of foreign affairs lost no time in drawing journalists' attention to the fact that he is a native of Nagasaki and that his wife was born in Nagasaki as well. He said he will construct his foreign policy in such a way as to meet the aspirations of his native town, which suffered in an atomic explosion.

If the first appointment creates a mood of optimism, the second appointment -- that of Kurihara as director-general of the National Defense Agency -- makes one feel sad, to put it bluntly, for he is known as an ardent champion of rapid arming by Japan. Also, at his first press conference he said that if Japan's military expenditure were to exceed the one percent of GNP limit, there would be nothing terrible in that and it would be quite natural.

[Bovin] Well, as it happens, I am not much of an optimist as regards the minister for foreign affairs either. The fact that Nakasone is going to work on foreign policy himself... well, it does not necessarily follow that it will be good foreign policy. After all, in my view he wants to transform Japan into a great power in the military and political respect too. Perhaps not right away, but he will bend things in that direction.

[Tsvetov] The thing is that immediately after the elections -- or rather, immediately after winning the election -- Nakasone said he considers it essential to improve Japanese-Soviet relations and that to this end he is even willing to go to the Soviet Union.

[Bovin] He has said that many times.

[Tsvetov] Moreover, at one of his press conferences, he even said he could go to the Soviet Union even before the end of this year.

[Shishlin] I would like to talk about all these relatively small changes in connection with the current visit to the Far East by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The ideas that have been set out there, ideas which develop our conception of how cooperation between the countries located in this vitally important area could look...

[Bovin interrupts] The significance of which, incidentally, is growing in world politics and economics.

[Shishlin] ...Yes. It seems to me that these ideas represent not only a development of the thoughts already put forward by the Soviet Union. It is, in fact, a question of a sort of very important political turning-point in our mutual relations with our Far Eastern neighbors, including Japan, including the Korean problem, including, of course, China. For it is a fact that the entire arc of conflicts and crises which accompany everyday political life in that extensive and vitally important and sensitive zone of the contemporary world, is built on some sort of quite definite structure and on some sort of quite definite political soil. But simply to ascertain this means going from bad to worse. For that reason our ideas are aimed at developing dialogue. We are not by any means presenting any kind of ultimatum. We are willing to listen to the thoughts of our Chinese neighbors, of our Chinese comrades regarding the creation of a stable security structure in the Asia-Pacific Ocean zone; we are willing to listen to Japan; we are willing to reach agreements; we are willing to conduct a broad dialogue on all the political, economic, and spiritual problems which naturally exist in the countries located in that zone.

[Tsvetov] This is all the more important since that area is becoming ever more significant in the economic, military, and political senses. Suffice it to say that the countries of the region -- the Asia-Pacific Ocean area -- are now experiencing the highest economic growth rates in the capitalist world. Our own Far Eastern regions are also developing at faster rates than other regions and 88 percent of our energy resources is concentrated in the Far East. Thus, the development of our Far Eastern regions, together with that of the other countries in the area provides opportunities for broad economic and trading links and thence, naturally, for political contacts as well.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1501

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET-URUGUAYAN COMMUNIQUE DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES

LD261754 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1518 GMT 26 Jul 86

["Joint Soviet-Uruguayan Communique"--TASS headline]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 26 Jul (TASS)--The full text of the joint Soviet-Uruguayan communique follows:

On the invitation of the Soviet government, Enrique V. Iglesias, minister of foreign relations of the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, was in the Soviet Union on an official visit from 24 to 27 July 1986.

Talks were held between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and E. Iglesias, minister of foreign relations of Uruguay, which took place in a business-like atmosphere goodwill.

During the talks, matters relating to Soviet-Uruguayan relations and the prospects for their development, as well as topical international problems of mutual interest were discussed.

In the course of a detailed exchange of view on a wide range of international issues, which revealed coincidence in both countries' positions on current key questions, deep concern was expressed at the continuing growth in international tension, the further

increase in the nuclear arms race, and the danger of spreading the arms race into space. The sides proceed from the premise that unification and intensification of the efforts of all peace-loving forces are necessary for overcoming these extremely dangerous tendencies. The ministers expressed the belief that new thinking, which took into consideration the interests of security of all states, was necessary in the present complex situation in international relations.

Both sides expressed the belief that in accordance with the UN Charter it was necessary for all states to refrain from the use of force or threat, to use it against territorial integrity, or political independence of any state.

The USSR minister of foreign affairs acquainted the Uruguayan minister for foreign affairs in detail with the program put forward by the Soviet Union for the complete and universal liberation of the world by the year 2000 of nuclear and chemical weapons and for averting the placement of weapons in space. He stressed that the initiative, put forward by the Soviet Union, to create the foundations of an all-embracing system for international security, was directed at ensuring international

peaceful coexistence, the supreme universal principle of interstate relations, and at finding ways to resolve global problems, settle regional conflicts, and root out terrorism.

The Uruguayan side treated the package of Soviet foreign policy initiatives put forward in statements by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with particular attention.

The ministers expressed the conviction that one way to restrain the arms race would be a total ban on nuclear tests, and in this regard they favored the conclusion of a treaty between the nuclear powers on a total and comprehensive ban on such tests. The USSR minister of foreign affairs stressed the significance of the USSR making and extending a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 6 August as an important action in the interests of peace. Both sides agreed that conducting nuclear explosions is a serious obstacle on the path to restrain the arms race and contradicts the ultimate aim -- the achievement of comprehensive and complete disarmament under effective international control. The sides spoke in favor of the quickest conclusion of an international agreement on the banning and elimination of chemical weapons.

Minister E. Iglesias was informed about the essence of the joint proposals for disarmament, for the strengthening of European and general security, and for the development of cooperation between states, which were put forward at the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states in Budapest in June. It was noted that the initiative for the mutual substantial reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe is a weighty addition to the program for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction. The sides think that discussion of the key problems of disarmament at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons, in the United Nations, at the Conference on Disarmament and at other international forums, must be activated by all available means.

The ministers emphasized that the solution of urgent tasks in ensuring international security, concerning interests of all of mankind, urgently required vigorous efforts by all states irrespective of their social system and geographic position. The ministers supported the development of international cooperation in use of space exclusively for peaceful purposes. They also spoke in support of creating an international procedure for safe development of nuclear power industry, increasing the role of the IAEA in these issues and involving the WHO and the UN Environmental program in them.

The Soviet side has stated support for the strivings of Latin American states in seeking to attain the strengthening of the non-nuclear status of Latin America in keeping with the treaty banning nuclear weapons in Latin America (Tlatelolco Treaty), and respect for this treaty, and also the protocols to it.

[Passage indistinct] The sides spoke in support of the striving of the Latin American countries to have the south Atlantic declared a zone of peace and cooperation. In connection with this, Foreign Affairs Minister E. Iglesias declared that Uruguay, being a signatory of the Tlatelolco treaty and a consulting member of the Antarctic Treaty, which determines the principles of demilitarization and nondeployment of nuclear weapons on that continent, resolutely supported the efforts directed at preserving all of the south Atlantic as a zone of peace free of all presence of nuclear weapons and the arms race. The Soviet side expressed understanding for the position of Uruguay.

The ministers called attention to the existence of a direct link between disarmament and development and in this context expressed themselves in favor of the resources currently being spent on armaments being switched to peaceful purposes. They noted that to deal with problems of economic backwardness in many parts of the world it is necessary that the fallacious principles of arms instead of development be replaced by the contrary order of things, namely disarmament for development.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1501

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET ASIAN SECURITY POLICIES OUTLINED

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 5, May 86 pp 61-69

[Article by M. Petrov]

[Text]

The tension that persists in a number of areas of the Asian continent and in the waters of the Pacific and Indian Oceans adjoining it, where a large part of the planet's population lives, and the attempts of imperialist quarters to turn this area into the eastern and southern flank of their militarist policies demand more vigorous action towards improving the political climate in this part of the globe.

As the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th CPSU Congress pointed out in its Political Report, "the significance of the *Asian and Pacific direction* is growing. In that vast region there are many tangled knots of contradictions and, besides, the political situation in some places is unstable. Here it is necessary, without postponement, to find the relevant solutions and paths. Evidently, this has to begin with the coordination and then the pooling of efforts in the interests of a political settlement of painful problems so as, in parallel, on that basis to at least take the edge off the military confrontation in various parts of Asia and stabilise the situation there.

"This is made all the more urgent by the fact that in Asia and other continents the *flashpoints of military danger* are not dying down. We are in favour of vitalising collective quests for ways of defusing conflict situations in the Middle East... in all of the planet's turbulent points. This is imperatively demanded by the interests of general security."

No matter how considerable the differences between the states of this area may sometimes be in their approach to the existing problems, it is still much more important that the peoples of Asia are united by common historical destiny and vital interests: they have to tackle much the same problems engendered by the past and checking their advance. This prompts the need for cooperation and goodneighbourly relations on the basis of a broad security concept which would meet the interests of each and all states of the region.

The many-faceted efforts towards more reliable security in Asia undertaken by the Soviet Union as both a European and an Asian and Pacific state are contributing considerably to the formation of this concept and its implementation through practical political work. The proposal advanced at the 27th Congress for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security and the principled foundations of such a system,

¹ Pravda, Feb. 26, 1986.

and the way of improving the international situation in the Asian-Pacific region, which was indicated in the Congress documents, were highly appraised in the Asian countries.

That this country is interested in promoting Asian security is only natural. The turn taken by political processes in Asia will affect not only security interests of the USSR and its allies and friends, but also the future of world peace.

The vast experience accumulated by the countries and peoples of Asia in the struggle for peace and security on the continent has prompted

the main principles of the concept of Asian security and rendered it universal character. The cornerstones of this concept were provided by the *five principles of peaceful coexistence* (Pancha Shila)² and *the ten principles of the Bandung Conference* of heads of state and government of 29 Asian and African countries (1955). Elaborated back in the mid-1950s by joint effort of states, these principles have played an important role in the restructuring of international relations in Asia on a qualitatively new, democratic foundation, and have lost none of their significance today.

The core of the concept of Asian security is formed by *constructive initiatives advanced over recent years by the socialist and non-aligned Asian states*. Their principal purpose is to eliminate the conflict situations and hotbeds of tension which imperialist interference helps fan up in a number of regions of the Asian continent, specifically, in the Middle East and Southeast Asia. Obviously, to settle the conflicts peacefully and with full and just consideration for the legitimate interests of all sides, suitable political platforms of the settlement must be elaborated which would not infringe on these interests, as well as a mechanism of negotiations adapted to each individual conflict.

It is important that through the efforts of Asian states political platforms for dealing with the very roots of conflict situations in Asia have either been or are being evolved. Suitable negotiations mechanisms have also been, or can be developed. This fact highlights the constructive and realistic character of the proposals advanced by peaceloving Asian states.

In the set of Soviet initiatives brought forward in the first half of the 1980s the following ones deserve special mention: on confidence-building measures in the Far East, a Middle East settlement and comprehensive approach to the issue of Asian security.

The proposal of the USSR advanced in 1981 to hold talks on *confidence-building measures in the Far East* provides for the participation in these talks of the USSR, the PRC, the MPR, the DPRK, and Japan, which have common frontiers in the Far East, as well as of the USA, which has military bases in Japan, South Korea and on the territories of some other countries and is conducting vigorous military activities there. As this initiative was elaborated in more detail, it was noted that the presence of all of these states at the negotiation table at the same time is not at all mandatory. Talks could begin on a bilateral basis.

² The five Pancha Shila principles: mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty; non-aggression; non-interference in each other's internal affairs; equality and mutual advantage; and peaceful coexistence, were first elaborated in April 1954 in the Preamble to the Agreement between India and the PRC on trade and contacts of the Tibetan region of China and India.

In the *proposals on a Middle East settlement* advanced in July 1984 the Soviet Union suggested that an international conference be convened as an instrument for dealing with this problem with the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organisation. The USSR and the USA should also take part in the conference as states which by virtue of circumstances are playing an important part in Middle Eastern affairs.

The Soviet Union advocates the convocation of such a conference "for the simple reason that it is in fact the only sensible and effective way to put an end to the state of war lasting for years in the Middle East and establish lasting peace there. This must be achieved without further bloodshed, intrigues and backstage deals between some countries at the expense of others but with due account for the lawful interests of all states involved without exception."³ This Soviet proposal, which in its main parts coincides with the common Arab platform elaborated at a summit conference in Fez in 1982 has met with a favourable reception in the Arab world.

In May 1985, the Soviet Union advanced another important proposal, that *on developing an integrated and comprehensive approach to the issue of Asian security*. This proposal stems from the fundamental principles of the Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet state, which for the first time in history declared the principle of peaceful coexistence. In his speech at the dinner in honour of Rajiv Gandhi, the Indian Prime Minister, on May 21, 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev voiced the idea of a possible pooling of efforts of Asian states with a view to elaborating such an approach to the issue of Asian security, taking account of the recently advanced constructive initiatives of the continent's countries, as well as the experience of the European process. "Obviously", said Mikhail Gorbachev, "different methods may be of use here, both bilateral talks and multilateral consultations, including the possibility, in the future, of an Asian forum to exchange opinions and join efforts in order to find constructive solutions."⁴

The USSR's call for a concerted effort towards finding ways to consolidate Asian security has evoked a lively response throughout the world, and especially in the countries of the Asian continent. The reaction to this call shows that many Asian governments would like to exchange opinions and contribute their effort to a joint constructive settlement of these issues.

Unfortunately, another kind of response has not been long in coming. The Soviet Union's unambiguous approach to the question of Asian security has not been to everyone's liking. Efforts to belittle the significance of the Soviet initiative have again produced the much-used argument to the effect that due to "certain geographical 'sparseness' of the Asian countries, the security formula elaborated in Europe is inapplicable to Asia, etc.

True, the situation in the Asian countries is in many respects unique, the way of life and political and socio-economic realities there differ substantially from those of European countries. However, the USSR's suggestion that parts of the European experience be used does not at all mean that the Soviet Union wants to mechanically transplant the Helsinki scheme to Asian soil. But the point is that the peace is indivisible, and against the background of today's complicated situation any local conflict threatens to grow into a large-scale, even global, confrontation.

Besides, such basic elements of the European experience as respect for sovereignty, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, non-use of force, peaceful settlement of disputes, the right of the peoples to decide

³ *Pravda*, Oct. 12, 1985.

⁴ *Pravda*, May 22, 1985.

their destiny, and development of equal, mutually beneficial cooperation are quite applicable to Asia. They are practically the same as the Pancha Shila and the Bandung principles.

At present, when imperialism has sharply stepped up its military activities in this vast area, there is urgent need to pool efforts aimed at consolidating Asian security, the steps that are advocated by the Soviet Union. It is necessary to protect Asia from foreign interference. This alone can help create conditions allowing the Asian countries to live in peace and friendship as befits good neighbours. That is why, advancing the idea of a comprehensive approach to the issue of Asian security, the Soviet Union at the same time suggested that *each member of the UN Security Council undertake not to interfere in the affairs of Asian, African and Latin American countries, not to threaten to use force against them, and not to involve them into military blocs*. For its part, the Soviet Union declared itself prepared to assume such an obligation.

A place of importance in the concept of Asian security by right belongs to the constructive proposals of other Asian socialist countries. This is, first and foremost, the proposal advanced by the MPR in 1981 *on the elaboration and signing of a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between Asian and Pacific states*. Its provisions are to be elaborated by all states wishing to become signatories to it. Should this initiative be put into practice, a major political step forward would be made on the Asian continent.

Increasingly broader support is being extended by the peaceloving Asian states to such important proposals of the DPRK as the one *on signing a peace treaty instead of the existing agreement of the truce, on adopting a declaration on non-aggression between the North and the South, on a mutual reduction of the armed forces and on turning the Korean Peninsula into a nuclear free zone*. Implementation of these proposals, which can serve as a sound foundation for a political settlement of the Korean problem, could do a great deal to improve the situation in Korea and in the Far East as a whole.

A constructive contribution to promoting goodneighbourliness, confidence and cooperation in Southeast Asia is made by three states of Indochina—the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea. The summits of the leaders of these states held in Hanoi and Vientiane in 1985 have confirmed their wish to *turn Southeast Asia into a zone of peace and cooperation*. The countries of Indochina have declared their readiness to take part in an international conference on issues of peace and security in Southeast Asia in order to ensure the implementation of the accords which would be reached between them and the ASEAN countries. They have also announced their support for the ASEAN countries' proposal to turn Southeast Asia into a nuclear-free zone, and confirmed their wish to improve relations with the People's Republic of China on the principles of peaceful co-existence.

In response to the suggestion of the ASEAN countries to hold direct and indirect negotiations for the purpose of regulating the situation in Southeast Asia and normalising the Kampuchean issue, the states of Indochina have stressed that it is a matter of major importance to draw up a list of participants. The People's Republic of Kampuchea is ready to open negotiations with the various Khmer groupings abroad on condition that Pol Pot's criminal clique is removed from the political arena. In 1985, Vietnam and Kampuchea announced their intention to continue the stage-by-stage withdrawal of Vietnamese volunteer units from Kampuchea com-

pleting it by 1990.⁵ The proposals advanced by Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea have clearly defined the political framework for establishing good-neighbourly relations between the ASEAN countries on the one hand and the states of Indochina on the other.

It is a matter of great political importance to realise the idea of the non-aligned littoral states of the Indian Ocean to turn it into a zone of peace, where all foreign military bases would be dismantled and where no one would threaten the security, independence and sovereignty of these states. Unfortunately, obstacles to this course are being erected by the USA, which is determined to build up its military presence in the region. The main issue in the campaign for *declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace* is that of convening an international conference on this problem not later than 1988 as was decided by the 40th UN General Assembly Session.

The sound elements of international relations in Asia would be consolidated by attaining a *political settlement around Afghanistan*, this sovereign non-aligned state which has become a target of large-scale and well-coordinated armed intervention from the outside, above all from the territory of Pakistan. The course adopted by Islamabad towards militarising the country with Washington's assistance is becoming a serious destabilising factor in South Asia threatening the security of neighbouring states, including India.

The way to reach a settlement around Afghanistan is to put into practice the constructive proposals of the government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. As Babrak Karmal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, President of the Revolutionary Council of the DRA, said in an interview for *The Muslim* newspaper of Pakistan, an early settlement of the situation around Afghanistan requires direct talks between the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and Pakistan. Afghanistan considers willingness to take part in such talks a sign of a sincere desire to reach a settlement in this field.

The initiatives advanced by the peaceloving Asian states, which form the core of the concept of Asian security, embrace virtually all major regions of the continent, including the Far East and Middle East, Southeast and South Asia, and the areas of the Pacific and the Indian Oceans adjoining the Asian continent. These initiatives stem from the wish of these countries to make, as early as possible, the principle of non-use of force the law of interstate relations in Asia.

The concept of Asian security should take full account of realities of the present nuclear age. Serious concern among the Asian peoples is caused by US plans to build multilateral military-political structure to the east and south of the Soviet Union along the pattern of NATO in the west, and to turn East and South Asia and the coastal waters of the Pacific and Indian oceans into a bridgehead where forward-based nuclear means may be deployed, something the USA has already done in Western Europe and the Atlantic Ocean. The Asian continent is covered with an extensive network of US military bases (about 350 in all), where nuclear weapons capable of reaching the territories of Asian socialist and non-aligned countries are stationed.

⁵ In 1982, 1983, 1984 and 1985, a number of Vietnamese volunteer units returned home having fulfilled their internationalist duty in people's Kampuchea.

The mounting nuclear threat in Asia, a consequence of the militarist policies of imperialism, prompts the need for extending the formula of Asian security to include such measures and steps as the *commitment of all nuclear powers to refrain from first use of nuclear weapons either in Asia or elsewhere; non-use of nuclear arms against the states and regions in Asia maintaining the non-nuclear status; adoption by the states which do not possess nuclear weapons of the three non-nuclear principles: not to have, not to produce, not to import them; the signing of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons by those Asian states which have not yet done so; complete termination of nuclear weapons tests, including in Asia and the Pacific and Indian Ocean basins.*

As for the USSR, it strictly abides by these principles in its policies both in Asia and on the other continents. Soviet efforts are directed at preventing, despite the intrigues of imperialist quarters, an arms race in Asia and not allowing this continent to be turned into an arena of nuclear rivalry.

Peoples of Asia have appreciated the USSR's solemn commitment not to be the first to use nuclear arms made public at the Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament in June 1982. Of great significance is the fact that a similar commitment has been assumed by the People's Republic of China. Should the rest of the nuclear powers take the clearcut commitment this would in fact amount to a ban on the use of nuclear weapons throughout the world, including the Asian continent.

Back in 1978 the Soviet Union stated that it would never use nuclear arms against the states which refrained from their production and purchase and have no such weapons on their territories. Simultaneously, this country voiced its readiness to conclude a special agreement on this issue with any of such non-nuclear states. Remaining in force is, for instance, the Soviet proposal to guarantee, by concluding a pertinent treaty, non-use of nuclear arms against Japan on the condition that the latter would undertake to strictly and steadily abide by its non-nuclear status.

An important factor of security in Asia, as well as of the other continents, is the obligation of the nuclear powers to prevent proliferation of nuclear arms in any form. The USSR did a great deal to make it possible for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to come into force. It was concluded in 1968 and signed by over 130 states, including the majority of Asian countries. But about 30 states have not become signatories, with two nuclear powers, France and China, among them. It has been reported that Israel has acquired a nuclear arsenal; and Pakistan is taking steps to produce the first "Islamic" bomb. This cannot but arouse grave concern among these countries's neighbours.

A big step on the road towards reducing nuclear armaments would be their qualitative and quantitative freezing which the Soviet Union has been steadily advocating. A lively response was aroused in Asia by the initiative to this effect advanced by heads of state and government of India, Argentina, Greece, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden in their Declaration of 1985. This initiative was highly acclaimed in the Soviet Union.

The socialist and many of the non-aligned Asian states extend full support to the constructive approach of the USSR to the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva, specifically, to the Soviet proposal to the USA to reach an accord on the complete ban of attack space weapons and the radical reduction of the nuclear missiles capable of reaching each other's territory. The peoples of Asia realise that the outcome of the talks will to a large extent determine the progress in the issue of Asian security.

It is clear that the concept of Asian security must provide for *refusal of the Asian and Pacific states to take part in the plans for militarising outer space*. Opposition to an arms race in space is mounting in many of the Asian countries. People there are coming to realise that the building of armaments for "star wars"—the real objective of the American "strategic defense initiative"—will only enhance the danger of a nuclear war and further destabilise the situation in the world, Asia included.

A negative stand towards the American "star wars" plans has been adopted by the PRC. At the 40th UN General Assembly Session, Wu Xueqian, PRC Minister of Foreign Affairs, spoke out in favour of the early conclusion of an international treaty which would completely ban and eliminate space weapons, since space belongs to the whole of mankind and should be used solely for peaceful purposes and mutual benefit.

It would be desirable to extend the concept of Asian security to embrace such steps as *freezing the levels of military activity in Asia and the Pacific and Indian Ocean basins; preventing the establishment of new and expansion of the existing military blocs in the region; creation of a zone of peace and nuclear-free zones in various parts of the Asian and Pacific region; elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of Asian states and in the Pacific and Indian Ocean basins; refusal to support from the outside the subversive antigovernment and terrorist armed groupings*.

Mikhail Gorbachev's programme advanced in his Statement of January 15, 1986, *for eliminating all nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of the current century*, received a wide response in the Asian countries. The Soviet programme is in harmony with the sentiments of the peoples of the Asian continent for whom the problems of peace and security are no less urgent than for the peoples of Europe.

The realisation of the Soviet programme for eliminating, stage-by-stage, nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of the current century, would fundamentally change the situation in Asia, rid the nations in that part of the globe of the fear of these deadly weapons and bring the security in that region to a qualitatively new level.

International developments in the 1980s have confirmed that Asian countries are opposing imperialists' overtly hostile attitude to these countries' drive towards regional cooperation, a stand detrimental to their security. The imperialists regard this drive almost as an excuse to increase interference in one region of Asia or another. The USA continues to encourage revanchist tendencies in the policies of the ruling circles of Japan. It is also working to build up a militarist Washington-Tokyo-Seoul alliance, is trying hard to revitalise the ANZUS bloc formed back in 1951, and is unceremoniously annexing, in fact, Micronesia seeking to turn this trust territory of the United Nations into a new military strategic bridgehead.

The project of forming a "Pacific Community" is being speeded up. The United States sees it as a chance to "coordinate" the military and economic policy of states in this vast region, specifically, to tighten its grip on ASEAN. Washington's plans have so far evoked a negative response in the ASEAN countries, which fear that should the "community" be formed, they may find themselves dependent on the USA and Japan first economically and then politically and militarily.

The Soviet Union, on the contrary, has consistently advocated a freeze on the level of military activity in Asia and in the Pacific and Indian Ocean basins. Proof of this are Soviet proposals aimed at turning the greatest possible part of the World Ocean into a zone of peace in the very near future. In March 1982, the Soviet Union voiced its readiness to reach an accord on the mutual limitation of naval activities of the opposi-

te blocs. This country has also declared itself willing to discuss the question of extending confidence-building measures to the basins of seas and oceans, especially the areas where the busiest sea routes lie.

The USSR has stated more than once that it is prepared to resume the Soviet-American talks on limiting military activities in the Indian Ocean basin (the talks were unilaterally broken off by Washington). Also remaining in force is the Soviet proposal advanced back in 1982 that all states whose ships plough the waters of this ocean should refrain from any steps which might complicate the situation in the region without waiting for the convocation of an international conference on declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

For its part, the Soviet Union would have no objections to extending similar measures on the limitation of military activity to the Pacific Ocean. Implementation of these proposals would have a major significance for consolidating security in Asia washed by these two oceans, where the military activity of the USA has reached a dangerous level.

Against the background of sharp exacerbation of the international situation through the fault of imperialism, increasing importance is attached to the measures proposed by different Asian states with a view to improving the situation in individual regions and creating peace and nuclear-free zones there. These zones, in the opinion of the Asian peoples, could be established along the following principles—removal of all foreign military bases from this region; non-deployment of nuclear weapons; non-interference in the internal affairs of states; peaceful settlement of disputes without foreign interference.

The USSR has responded favourably to the *establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean*. A corresponding agreement was concluded by the insular states of Oceania, Australia and New Zealand at the 16th Session of the South Pacific Forum held in Avarua (Cook Islands) in August 1985. Under the agreement, deployment, production and testing of nuclear weapons have been banned there forever.

A major place in the concept of Asian security should belong to *developing all-round trade and economic and other cooperation of the continent's states on a bilateral and multilateral basis, which could do a great deal to make the international climate in Asia healthier*.

Good headway is being made in the relations between the USSR and Mongolia, Vietnam, Laos, Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Kampuchea, which are developing on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. A new strong impetus to the multi-faceted contacts with these countries, including coordination of actions for peace and security in Asia, has been given by the talks between Soviet leaders and Iambyn Batmönh, Le Duan, Kaysone Phomvihane, Kim Il Sung, Heng Samrin held recently.

In the joint Soviet-Mongolian statement on the results of the visit to the MPR by Eduard Shevardnadze in January of this year, it was particularly stressed that a reasonable alternative to the heightened tension in Asia are the constructive and concrete proposals of the USSR, the MPR and other socialist countries, as well as the non-aligned states, including the well-known Bandung principles. Mongolia, which is invariably supporting the Soviet idea of a complex approach to ensuring peace and security in Asia, considers the Soviet Union's new comprehensive proposals on disarmament as an important contribution, whose implementation would fundamentally change the situation on the Asian continent as well and would bring security in this vast region of the world to a qualitatively new level.

Effort by the continent's socialist countries to normalise relations with the People's Republic of China are also contributing substantially to the consolidation of peace in Asia. Beginning in October 1982, Soviet-Chinese political consultations between special representatives of both governments have been held on a regular basis. In December 1984, Ivan Arkhipov, First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers visited China, and in 1985, Yao Yilin Vice Premier of the PRC State Council came on a visit to the USSR. During these visits, the sides signed a number of agreements on economic and scientific and technological cooperation. As was noted at the 27th CPSU Congress, "One can say with gratification that there has been a measure of improvement of the Soviet Union's relations with its great neighbour—socialist China. The distinctions in attitudes, in particular, to a number of international problems remain. But we also note something else—that in many cases we can work jointly, cooperate on an equal and principled basis, without prejudice to third countries".

A vivid example of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is provided by the Soviet-Indian traditionally friendly relations which are marked by a great variety of forms and extend to many spheres. In the talk between Mikhail Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi held on October 26, 1985, the sides voiced their wish to increase cooperation on the world scene in order to promote the cause of peace and security in Asia and throughout the world.

There has been an advance in the mutually beneficial cooperation between the USSR and the ASEAN countries. A recent contribution to it

was the visit of Yakov Ryabov, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to Indonesia and Malaysia, which took place in autumn 1985.

An important place in improving the international situation in the Far East and Asia as a whole belongs to Soviet-Japanese relations. Unfortunately, owing to Japan's increasingly active adherence to US and NATO military strategy, their present state fails to live up to what could be expected. Another factor that does nothing to make this relations better is the non-existent "territorial issue" resurrected by the Japanese side.

The USSR has always wished to maintain friendly, extensive and many-sided relations with Japan. Soviet proposals still stand: to conclude a Soviet-Japanese agreement on goodneighbourliness and mutually beneficial cooperation, which would help create a favourable atmosphere for continuing the talks on the peace treaty. The Soviet Union has also advanced other proposals, which pertain, specifically, to economic cooperation and cultural contacts. Helping facilitate the development of bilateral relations was Eduard Shevardnadze's visit to Japan in January of this year, during which an agreement was signed on trade turnover and payments between the two countries for the period 1986-1990.

The response evoked by Soviet peace initiatives among the political quarters of Asian countries has shown that they are aware of the need to improve the international situation on the continent. And this is only natural, for Soviet policy of peace and cooperation meets the wishes and hopes of the countries and peoples of Asia and of other regions of the world.

Undoubtedly, the Soviet Union hardly intends to impose a ready-made formula of Asian security on other Asian nations. The USSR calls on the Asian countries to jointly take part in working out such a formula, using bilateral as well as multilateral contacts.

Obviously, working through and actually implementing the conception of Asian security is a long-term goal. In order to effectuate this objective, a step-by-step approach is necessary, beginning with the simple and advancing to the more complex. Taken into consideration is the fact that from those bilateral and multilateral agreements which have already been reached in one or another area of the continent, the Asian governments would advance to agreements of a more serious nature, covering many aspects in that way, gradually extending the base of durable peace and stability on the continent as a whole. And, of course, it is crucial that concrete steps be commenced with the aim of stabilising the situation in those regions of Asia where the "hot spots" of war danger are still smouldering.

The Soviet concept of Asian security, which calls for concerted effort in order to promote the security of all Asian states, whether large or small, proceeding from the experience gained both on this continent and elsewhere, is a sound basis for furthering understanding and cooperation among Asian states, and for establishing reliable peace there.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English Translation Copyright: Progress Publishers 1986

/9317

CSO: 5200/1490

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET-CHINESE TALKS ON ARMS CONTROL ISSUES

TASS Report

LD250640 Moscow TASS in English 0624 GMT 25 Jul 86

[Text] Beijing July 25 TASS -- Soviet-Chinese consultations have been held here on the problem of the prevention of the arms race in space and on other disarmament problems in the course of which the sides set forth their stands. The exchange of views was held in a businesslike and frank atmosphere and promoted a better understanding of the positions and views of each other.

From the Soviet side the consultations were attended by Viktor Karpov, head of the Arms Limitation and Disarmament Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and from the Chinese side -- by Li Daoyu [spelling as received], head of the Department of International Organizations and Conferences of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China.

The Soviet representative was received by Zhou Nan, deputy minister of foreign affairs of China.

XINHUA Report

OW251202 Beijing XINHUA in English 1125 GMT 25 Jul 86

[Text] Beijing, July 25 (XINHUA) -- V.P. Karpov, director of the Bureau of Arms Limitation and Disarmament in the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, left here for home today after a four-day stay in Beijing as guest of the Soviet Embassy in China.

While in Beijing, Karpov was entertained at a dinner given by Chinese Vice-Foreign Minister Zhou Nan and exchanged views on the issue of disarmament with Li Daoyu, director of the International Organizations Department in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1501

RELATED ISSUES

BRIEFS

SOVIET-CANADIAN TALKS--Ottawa, 25 July TASS--By TASS correspondent Artyom Melikyan. Canada's Deputy Prime Minister Donald Mazankowski on Thursday received Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, deputy foreign minister of the USSR. The sides discussed during the conversation the Soviet Union's latest disarmament initiatives and the situation at various international forums discussing questions of limiting and restricting armaments and promoting confidence-building measures. Soviet-Canadian consultations on questions of disarmament and arms control were held at the Canadian Foreign Ministry on the same day. They were attended by Alan Sullivan, deputy foreign minister, and officials from the Canadian foreign and defense ministries. A conversation was also held between Bessmertnykh and James Taylor, first deputy foreign minister of Canada, on topical aspects of the further development of Soviet-Canadian relations. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0922 GMT 25 Jul 86 LD] /12858

SOVIET-SWISS TALKS--Bern, 25 July TASS--Soviet-Swiss working consultations on problems of the international situation, especially in the context of work for stopping the arms race and for disarmament were held here. The sides also discussed questions of the general European process, including the Stockholm conference and the coming European meeting in Vienna. On the Soviet side, the consultation were attended by Lev Mendelevich, member of the Collegium of the USSR Foreign Ministry and Ivan Ippolitov, USSR ambassador to Switzerland, and on the Swiss side, by officials of the Federal Foreign Affairs Department headed by Aduard Brunner, state secretary of this department. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1927 GMT 25 Jul 86 LD] /12858

WU XUEQIAN MEETS U.S. ACDA HEAD--Beijing, July 31 (XINHUA)--Wu Xueqian, Chinese state councillor and minister of foreign affairs, met Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, here this afternoon. Vice-Foreign Minister Qian Qichen discussed disarmament issues with Adelman yesterday afternoon and this morning. The U.S. official arrived July 29 and is scheduled to leave here tomorrow to tour Xian, Guilin and Guangzhou before going home. [Text] [Beijing XINHUA in English 0937 GMT 31 Jul 86 OW] /6091

CSO: 5200/4061

- END -